THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

CANON LEONARD HODGSON, D.D., Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford, has published his Croall Lectures for 1942–1943 — *The Doctrine of the Trinity*.[1] These lectures are an attempt to expound the doctrine of the Trinity in terms of present-day thought. The attempt is prefaced by a consideration of the sense in which we may regard this doctrine as a matter both of revelation and of philosophy and by an exposition of its Biblical basis, and of its formulation in the creeds of the Early Church.

The lecturer prepares the way for his philosophical view of the Trinity by recalling the idealist movement of last century which arose in opposition to the naturalism which had become predominant. The movement derived from Kant through Hegel and was introduced into these islands by the Cairds and Green, and was afterwards developed by Bradley, Bosanquet, and Pringle-Pattison. It was welcomed by Christian theologians and for half a century dominated British philosophical theology.

There is a parallel, as the lecturer suggests, between this episode in the history of British theology and the Logos-doctrine period of the patristic age. The alliance then made between the Church and the world of thought served to bring the gospel home to the Gentile world. By the time it became clear that the doctrine concerning a Second Person in the Godhead was incompatible with the Logos-doctrine, it had become firmly established.

The idealist movement appears to have now spent itself. But it had value for the theologians in asserting the directive supremacy of mind in the universe, and also in asserting that finite personalities might exist in their relative independence while still included in the unifying personality of the Absolute. (It should, however, be remembered that Bradley did not teach the inclusiveness of personality, but concluded to an impersonal Absolute.)

Is there any element of permanent gain here for theology, just as there was after the Logos-doctrine was discarded in the patristic age? The idealist theologians were no doubt insufficiently sensitive to the difficulties of the conception they so eagerly embraced, but they at any rate learned from the philosophers that the kind of internally constitutive unity which Christian theology ascribes to God is, if a mysterious, a rational conception. Or rather, they learned not to forgo this conclusion on the ground that the constituent elements in the Godhead are each personal—indeed fully personal in the modern sense of being intelligent, purposive centres of consciousness.

'So far, so good. For this the Christian theologian must be grateful. But he must beware of going further and imagining that the idealist metaphysic is an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity itself, that the self-expression of the Absolute in this world of appearances is a philosophical statement of the theological doctrine.'

For the metaphysics implied by the Christian revelation is radically divergent from the idealist metaphysics, with its assumptions that reality is a systematic whole which is rational and intelligible, and that this space-time universe of our experience exists within that whole, being internal to the eternal being of God. A sinful world is not an intelligible world, and a created world is a world of relative independence over against God. It is true that in his Gifford Lectures Dr. Temple has made a gallant and brilliant attempt to reconcile idealism and the philosophy of the Christian revelation, but any such attempt is vain.

Accordingly, the lecturer turns to a consideration of the revolt against the idealist metaphysics. An age in which attention is directed to the changing actualities of space and time has succeeded an age which was dominated by the conviction of the reality and importance of the unchanging eternal. The result is sometimes complete scepticism with regard to any knowledge of ultimate reality whatever. But empiricism need not fall into scepticism if account be taken of the empirical material which theology derives from revelation.

The presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity in these lectures is essentially realist and empiricist, as resting on the view that the task of philosophy and of philosophical theology is to interpret what is given in experience, not to prescribe what may be given. It is here contended that the evidence does not favour the way of thinking which makes

[1] Nisbet; 15s. net.

the life of creatures in any sense internal to the life of God.

What is the empirical evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity? It consists of the earthly life of Jesus Christ, and all that has sprung from it in the new life of communion with God. The doctrine of the Trinity is thus an inference to the nature of God drawn from the empirical evidence given by God in His historical revelation of Himself. This evidence requires us to believe in a God 'whose unity unifies three activities each of which is made known to us as a distinct Person in the full sense of that word. Each is a He, none is an it.'

The lecturer does not agree with St. Thomas and Calvin that God's revelation is given in the form of propositions; but he does agree with them, as all neo-Thomists and neo-Calvinists should, that the events which form the substance of the Biblical revelation are the 'key-feature' for our knowledge of God.

The lecturer's realist and empirical standpoint should be clearer if we quote the closing sentences of his discussion of the Trinity on its philosophical side: 'I have attempted to show that the idea of what I have called an internally constitutive unity is not repugnant to reason; I have called attention to certain idealist arguments which encourage us to believe that in God both the Unity and its Constituents may be personal; and I have pointed out that it is generally characteristic of our earthly experience to know the ultimate unities not in their unity but in their multiplicity. There I must let the matter rest.' 'It is more philosophical there to let it rest than to theorise on lines which involve the denial of the revelation we have received.'

In the rest of the book Canon HODGSON tests his conclusions on the Trinity by comparing them with the expositions of St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and Calvin; then draws out some practical corollaries of the doctrine for Christian life and worship.

A small but thought-provoking book has recently appeared on *The Severity of God*, by the Rev. D. E. HART-DAVIES, M.A., D.D.[1] In it the writer deals in the main with certain Old Testament stories of divine judgment which have often been regarded as a stumbling block to faith, and indeed are often dismissed as acts unworthy of the Christian God. The evidence of careful exegesis is brought forward to show that there is more in these narratives than meets the eye at a superficial glance, and the writer is justified in his conclusion that 'no one should presume to criticize or condemn any statement in the Holy Scriptures until great care has been taken to become thoroughly acquainted with its precise content and context.'

[1] Pickering & Inglis; 4s. net.

Whatever may be thought of the exegesis of particular passages this whole subject of the severity of God is one which deserves more serious consideration than it is wont to receive. St. Paul brackets together 'the goodness and severity of God,' and in former times Christian men found no difficulty in the conjunction. They had an exalted sense of the sovereignty of God and did not presume to challenge His acts. 'He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?'

In more recent days, however, the doctrine of the love of God has gained the ascendency to such a degree as to eclipse the thought of His severity. No doubt men, thinking too exclusively of God as sovereign Lord and Judge, have attributed to Him actions and motives which cannot be reconciled with the revelation of His love in Christ. But equally it is true that a one-sided apprehension of the love of God has, in our time, led to a sentimental view of divine providence which practically excludes judgment and the punishment of sin. It is not the love of God which is in question. That has been revealed beyond dispute. The question is whether our interpretation of it is true and adequate. Are we qualified to judge as to what may or may not be compatible with the divine love? In particular, are we, who ourselves are sinful, in a position to determine the reactions of a holy and loving God to sin? The point is that it is exceeding precarious for any man simply to take his idea of the love of God and to build upon it, in a kind of *a priori* way his whole theology.

Many systems of thought have been built in that way and afterwards made shipwreck on the bedrock of facts. There was a time when astronomers, obsessed by the perfection of the circle, took it for certain that the heavenly bodies, being perfect, must move in perfect circles. Similarly it has been a persistent dream of philosophers that by the exercise of pure reason they might discover the governing principle of existence which would enable them to tell what the world is and how it has come to be. In this connexion one naturally thinks of Hegel whose metaphysic was a most impressive logical construction, to many minds utterly convincing, but having the fatal defect that it does not square with the facts.

Taught by these failures the scientist, and let us hope the philosopher also, has turned back from the high *priori* road and given himself to a humble

and devoted study of the facts. No scientist would begin by laying down laws as to what may or may not be possible. He would never dream, for instance, of saying with Matthew Arnold, 'Miracles don't happen.' On the contrary he is prepared to face the facts, sitting at the feet of Nature humble and teachable. It is this quality of intellectual humility and teachableness which is much to be desired on the part of religious thinkers who are prepared to tell us offhand what is or is not consistent with the love of God, and are ready to dismiss or explain away a Bible narrative that does not seem to square with their ideas. To dismiss a few Old Testament stories does not settle the vast problem of the severity of God.

The problem of the severity of God is not confined to the Old Testament. It equally confronts us in the New, and nowhere more impressively than in the teaching of our Lord Himself. It is true that He did not use His power to bring judgments upon men as the Apocryphal Gospels allege He did and as His enemies feared He would. Yet none ever spoke with more conviction and solemn emphasis of the absolute certainty and severity of the judgments of God. It is not St. Paul or any other of the apostles who are here most emphatic. It is Christ Himself. Nothing could surpass in fearsomeness the imagery which He uses in speaking of the doom of those who have set themselves against God. It is doubtless highly unsafe to turn these images into a doctrinal system, for the conditions of life in the eternal are utterly inconceivable to us. But taking them as they stand, they present a prospect to shake the stoutest heart. At the same time they are in the highest degree morally bracing, and the gospel is gravely impoverished if they are overlaid by a sickly sentiment, and made innocuous.

In short, that there is a real and terrible element of severity in God is both manifest in Nature and revealed in Scripture, and is not lightly to be dismissed as contrary to faith in the love of God. Our Lord has warned us against judging our fellowmen and still less competent are we to judge of the acts and purposes of God. We do not know all the facts; what we see we see through a glass darkly; conscience itself is but partially enlightened. It may well be that if we saw sin as God sees it, then some acts of His providence, which look to us like wanton cruelty, would be recognised as necessary acts of cosmical surgery. Thomas Goodwin says somewhere that in the great day 'God will justify His own acts of justification.' He will vindicate His ways with the redeemed. With equal assurance we may say that He will justify His acts of judgment, or in other words will vindicate the righteousness of all His ways with men.

The Dynamic of Reconstruction, by the Rev. E. D. P. Kelsey, M.A., Vicar of Christ's Church, Watford [1] is described by the author as 'a modern evangelical approach to the problems of to-day.' He claims no originality for his thinking and modestly describes his book as an attempt to assimilate and pass on, at the level of the average mind, the best thinking of others, especially of the 'Christian News-Letters' group. This, of itself, would be a useful piece of work, but the book is more than that. It is a survey, by a strong and forthright mind, of the situation in which we find ourselves to-day, and of the Christian way out.

That situation has been created by movements directed against the growing power of a restless working class and against the political institutions that have been unable to cope with it. Big business, modern finance, the development of industry, the new power techniques, growing competition for export markets were producing the same sort of results everywhere. The reactions were different in different countries, according to their history. Nazism was one of them and its success was due to the fact that the situation it dealt with was the same all over the world and nowhere were the attempts to handle it successful on traditional lines.

The defeat of Germany will bring us up against the problem of how we are to deal with this contemporary situation. Each country must and can only achieve the solution for itself; but it cannot achieve it by itself, for it will only be possible within a new European unity, economic, political and cultural. Economic, because only an economy planned on an international basis can secure within each country those improved labour standards, and the social security which our aims demand; political, because peace cannot be secure in Europe unless national sovereignties are combined in a higher political unity; cultural, because there can be neither political nor economic co-operation unless the same moral principles are accepted everywhere and unless there is a common Faith which proclaims them with divine authority.

Mr. Kelsey then turns to the problem as it faces us in this country. One of his main points in the book is that the problem and its solution are everywhere rooted in history. That is why a large part of his space is taken up with reviews of the historical development in each country. In our history the dominant fact is the rise and influence of the Industrial Revolution. This has often been described, but there is a masterly statement of its nature and results on pages 63 ff.

[1] James Clarke; 5s. net.

It had a decisive, and, it must be said, disastrous influence on religion. It sent religion, particularly the Evangelical Movement, scurrying into its shell. The Evangelicals proclaimed religion to be a purely individual thing, individual and 'spiritual.' Religion had nothing to do with politics or economics ; it was the salvation of the soul. The same thing can be said of the Oxford Movement, which stood, like Evangelicalism, for the detachment of the Church from the world and the separation of sacred and secular. The Oxford Movement had a marked awakening effect on the Church itself, but it had nothing to say about the social and economic problem which exercised men's minds more and more as the Industrial Revolution proceeded.

It is true there was a Christian Social Movement, led by men like Maurice, Kingsley, and Hughes, which proclaimed a faith relevant to everyday life, a Kingdom of God which should be a reality on earth, which also did claim to direct and control man's economic activity with a gospel for the individual as a member of a society. This might have saved the situation, but it was never accepted. It is not accepted to-day, and there lies the root of the problem we speak of as Reconstruction and the New Order. It is not a matter of social, economic, or political reform ; it is a matter of a faith related to life in society and in the natural world as created by God.

The 'Social Gospel' was not accepted either outside or inside the Church for three reasons. First, because men had ceased to look on the Church as the champion of the disinherited and oppressed. It was identified in the popular mind with privilege and the maintenance of the *status quo*. Second, the achievements of applied science, the rise in the standard of living, made the Church superfluous. And, third, the widening of the whole intellectual outlook cut at the roots of the authority exercised by the Church over the minds of men. Humanism displaced the Christian Faith, for the only faith which the Church offered was other-worldly.

What has been said is true of the nineteenth century. When we turn to our own day in the twentieth there are signs of better things. The confident dogmatic materialism of science is gone. The Church has turned again to theology with a new outlook on reality that makes room for conclusions reached in other departments of knowledge. The Bible has been freed from the rigid, narrow limitations of a literal interpretation. A new emphasis has been laid on corporate experience instead of the older religious individualism. The historical Christ has been rediscovered and a realistic view has been reached of the nature of the Kingdom of God.

But there is far more to discourage. The Church is still taken up with its own preservation, with secondary matters of ritual, of the validity of its orders ; its teaching is largely ethical rather than theological ; there is little attempt to welcome and assimilate the findings of modern knowledge or to use language which has a current meaning, still less to relate Faith to problems of public and corporate life. Churchmanship is the parochialism of a congregation. Faith is a private affair, and outside the Church are masses of people who have never had any contact with the Christian Faith as members of a community in which it is practised. The effects are evident in a shallowness of thinking and living, in the weakening of any sense of social responsibility and duty, and in the absence of Faith except in Fate and Chance.

In all this there is a challenge to the Church and to Christian people. The choice before us is one between a pagan civilization and a Christian order. The problem is not technical ; it is spiritual. It is the revitalizing of the conscious and organic relationship of the Christian Faith with society. This demands an insistent reproclamation of the 'ends' and 'values' of life implicit in the Christian Faith in relation to the order of society. But it means also a new evangelistic effort which will win the whole allegiance and consecration of men and galvanize them into new ways of social activity.

But this evangelistic effort must be directed to the situation as it is to-day ; it will need a new emphasis and a new technique and must find new ways and associations for Christian social action which will generate it in society. Mr. KELSEY recognizes that our generation is a paganized one, with little belief in God, little belief in man and no sense of sin. It needs Christ and it needs Doctrine and it needs *Christians*. The spiritual revival for which we look, and without which reconstruction will lack the dynamic which can generate the will to it and direct that will aright, is not a wave of religious emotionalism, not a mass return to religious services and observances, but a demonstration by Christian men of the Christian Faith in action. The pages in which the author deals directly with the necessity of Christ and the necessity of Christian living are the finest in a fine book. But the whole book with its searching analysis of the modern situation and its challenge to the Church is a notable commentary on the task before our generation and the way in which it must be faced.

Jesus—Man or Mediator?[1]

By the Reverend R. Abba, M.A. (Cantab.), Sheffield.

'Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?' Answers not merely diverging but conflicting confront us in the pages of history; and their number is legion. Arius regards Him as a demi-god; Smith and Drews dismiss Him as a myth. The Jewish priests accuse Him as an agitator; Pilate—howbeit in scorn—styles Him a king. For the Pharisees He was a fanatic; for the Galilean peasants, a prophet. Bartimæus hails the Son of David; Peter confesses the Son of God.

I. The Nature of the Problem.

Such a conflict of opinions in itself ensues but naturally from the impact of a great personality upon the world of men, but the permanence of the problem which is here represented places it in a class apart. That the Person of Christ, after demanding explanation for nineteen centuries, should continue to challenge the best thought of each age is a fact unique in history.

But what constitutes the specific problem of Christ's Person? It arises out of a tension between qualities of His personality which evade all attempts to form a logical synthesis of them. We meet Christ to-day in the realm of experience. We have been apprehended by Him as really as was St. Paul on the Damascus road, and we know Him through the operation of His renewing power in our lives. Here then is the first fact of all Christological data—the experience of the living Christ.

But with this first fact is coupled a second—this experience has an historical basis; it results from the preaching of an historic Person. These two elements, the timeless and the historical, are united indissolubly in the Christian Faith; they are fused together in Christ. But this very fact creates the problem of His Person. He belongs to this world; 'this muddy vesture of decay' doth grossly shut Him in. Yet in Him God draws near to man; the powers of the age to come are mediated through Him. This fact was true in the days of His flesh; it is true for us to-day.

II. The Synoptic Data.

No picture of Jesus of Nazareth which fails to portray this perplexing antinomy does full justice to the New Testament sources of His life. In these He is presented as man, fully and empirically man. His physical body needs food and sleep for the resuscitation of its powers (Mk 4^{38} 11^{12}, Mt 4^{2}, Jn $4^{6.7}$). He shares the common lot of man, working in the carpenter's shop (Mk 6^{3}), weeping at the grave of a friend (Jn 11^{35}). Perplexity, anger, sorrow, despair all come His way (Mk 3^{5} 11^{15-17} $14^{33f.}$ [cf. Mt $26^{36f.}$ and Lk $22^{40f.}$], Lk 13^{34} 19^{41}, Jn 12^{27}). A limited knowledge shuts Him in (Mk 13^{32}). Finally He dies the death of a slave.

Yes, the Nazarene was a man, but a Man who stands alone: no merely human categories are adequate for Him. 'Never man spake like this man.' Mighty works showed themselves at His hands; the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed and the deaf heard; even the dead were raised up (Mt 11^{5}; cf. Mk 1^{21-45} 2^{1-12} 5^{22-43}). The wind and the sea obeyed Him (Mk 4^{37-41}; cf. 6^{48}).

But the uniqueness of Jesus is discernible at a deeper level than these σημεῖα; it is seen predominantly in His own self-consciousness. While there is no evidence in the Synoptic Gospels that Jesus ever explicitly claimed the actual title 'Son of God,' His references to Himself as 'the Son' and to God as in a special sense His Father show that He was conscious of standing in a unique filial relationship to God; that He knew Himself to be *the* Son of God, and that He made this fact plain. This consciousness becomes acutely real at His baptism (Mk 1^{11}); three disciples share it at the Transfiguration (Mk 9^{7}; cf. Mt 17^{5}, Lk 9^{35}, 2 P 1^{17}).

Sayings attesting this fact of Jesus' unique filial consciousness are to be found in all the Synoptic sources. Four which appear in Mark first claim our attention: 1. Mk 12^{6}. This Parable of the Vineyard is based on the allegory of Is $5^{1f.}$ and includes a direct allusion to Christ as the εἷς υἱὸς ἀγαπητός. Jesus, convinced that He has been sent by God as a final envoy to Israel, quietly assumes a position superior to the prophets and implies that He is conscious of a unique relation of sonship.

2. Mk 13^{32}. This saying is one of Schmiedel's nine 'foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus.' Its genuineness has been contested by the view which asserts that the phrase 'neither the Son' may be a scribal gloss, or may have replaced an original reference to the Son of Man. There is no ground, however, for this assumption: on the contrary it is most unlikely that words which limit the knowledge of Jesus would have been invented by the Early Church. The saying

[1] A paper read to the Sheffield Theological Circle on 13th April 1943 (here considerably abridged).

has a ring of genuineness, and if this be conceded is conclusive proof that Jesus spoke of Himself as 'the Son.' [1]

3. Mk 14^{36} (cf. Mt $26^{39.\ 42}$, Lk 22^{42}). Mark alone preserves the Aramaic אַבָּא and adds ὁ πατήρ, according to his custom, as an explanatory note for the benefit of his Roman readers. Matthew and Luke give simply the vocative πάτερ, and in *v.*[42] Matthew repeats it with the possessive pronoun as πάτερ μου. But whether the Greek has πάτερ or ὁ πατήρ or πάτερ μου, in each case the underlying Aramaic word to be presupposed on the testimony of Mk 14^{36} is אַבָּא. This is the definite form meaning strictly 'the Father'; but during the obsolescence of the form with the pronominal suffix (אַבִּי as in Dn 5^{13}) it became the regular form for 'my Father,' as did also אִמָּא for 'my mother.' Thus we see that Jesus regularly addressed God in prayer as simply אַבָּא—'my Father'—as distinct from 'your Father' of whom He spoke to the disciples (Mt 5, 6, 7 *passim*). It must be noted that the πάτερ ἡμῶν of Mt 6^{9} and Lk 11^{2} occurs in a prayer which was meant for the disciples, not for Jesus Himself.

4. Mk $14^{61.\ 62}$ (cf. Mt $26^{63.\ 64}$, Lk $22^{67\text{-}70}$). Although Jewish thought had by no means always identified the Messiah with the Son of God, that identification had been made in late Jewish literature (En 105^{2}, 2 Es $7^{28.\ 29}$ 14^{9}); and Caiaphas would know this. Thus although Jesus, according to Mark, had nowhere previously claimed the title 'Son of God,' yet here He accepts it (ἐγώ εἰμι) and so for the first time in this Gospel publicly declares who He is.

We must now examine in detail a 'Q' passage —Mt $11^{25\text{-}27}$, Lk $10^{21.\ 22}$. In spite of its Johannine ring Harnack accepts this as genuine. His lengthy discussion of the Greek tenses in the second part of the saying, however, is irrelevant in view of the fact that ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός are most probably used here, not as theological terms, but to translate the Aramaic אַבָּא and בְּרָא, and so may well refer to a relationship which exists universally between a father and a son; only the son and the father are mutually known to each other. Yet here, as in other passages we have noted, אַבָּא could be equally well translated ὁ πατήρ μου. But in either case the point of the saying remains unaltered. He who stands in so close a relationship to God is the only possible Mediator of the whole revelation of God, πάντα referring back to ταῦτα. That which holds good between father and son in general is straightway applied to Jesus and His Heavenly Father; and this peculiar relation of Jesus to God cannot be transmitted to others. Thus what is expressed is the consciousness of a unique relationship to God.

Two 'M' passages now call for consideration: (1) Mt 17^{25}. The point of this saying is that earthly kings do not exact tribute of their own sons, and so neither will the Heavenly King exact tribute of His Son. It must be noted that the question about the payment of taxes referred only to Jesus (*v.*[24]). Hence the saying implies that He regarded Himself as in a special sense *the* Son.

(2) Mt 28^{19}. This verse raises difficulties since the practice of the Early Church was to baptize into the Name of Jesus only (Ac 8^{16} 10^{48} 19^{5}; cf. Ro 6^{3} and Gal 3^{27}); hence the trinitarian formula may be a late doctrinal expansion and not the *ipsissima verba* of the Risen Christ. Even so, the fact that these words were put into the mouth of Jesus would indicate that to the primitive community they were not incongruous with His use of the title 'the Son' in referring to Himself.

There remains to be examined in this connexion one more passage—Lk $2^{48.\ 49}$. This occurs in the Hebrew or Aramaic source containing the birth narratives which Luke incorporates in the early part of his Gospel. It is the only reference we have to Jesus speaking of God as His Father prior to His baptism. The phrase τοῦ πατρός μου is made emphatic by being contrasted with ὁ πατήρ σου in the previous verse.

We have seen, then, that the Synoptic evidence is unanimous in its witness to a unique filial consciousness in Jesus. This fact is attested, not by one source only, but by Mark, 'Q,' 'M' and the Semitic source of Luke 1 and 2. Thus it is clear that men saw in Jesus the consciousness of a unique relationship to God; a relationship which was not merely religious and ethical but different in kind from that which others either possessed or were capable of attaining.

Moreover His disciples were conscious of 'God's Presence and His very self' in this Man of Nazareth. There was in His Person that quality of the numinous which Otto calls the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*; the sense of 'otherness' characteristic of the Divine. 'He taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes' (Mk 1^{22}—cf. Mt 7^{29}). The rough fisherman falls down at His knees saying, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord' (Lk 5^{8}). As Cave says, 'They (the disciples) followed Him, in spite of all perplexity, because they felt in Him the presence of the Divine, the strange attraction and repulsion of the Holy made manifest in His human life.' [2]

III. The New Testament Development.

The remainder of the New Testament witnesses to these two elements, the human and the divine,

[1] So Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 34–35.

[2] S. Cave, *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 29.

in the Man Jesus, but with a growing emphasis upon the divine. Nowhere is He regarded as just man. The so-called 'Adoptionist Christology' of Acts is not strictly speaking a Christology at all, but mirrors the unreflecting enthusiasm of early days. Of one thing this primitive community was certain; the Jesus they had known in the flesh was κύριος—a word which must be interpreted against its Old Testament background. The intensely Jewish colouring of these early sermons in Acts with their appeal to Old Testament prophecy, together with the survival elsewhere of the Aramaic מָרָן or מָרַנָא (1 Co 16^{22}) precludes any pagan ideas of Christ as a 'cult lord.' The Man Jesus was now reigning with Divine authority. This fact filled the horizon long before its implications were thought out.

The beginning of Christological development prior to the influence of St. Paul is reflected in 1 Peter. We find here that Χριστός has become a proper name and 'Jesus' is never used by itself. Weiss explains this as being 'due to the fact that the person of Jesus is contemplated by the Christians always and exclusively in His specific quality as Mediator of salvation.' Moreover *vv.*[10] and [11] of ch. 1 imply that Christ is thought of as a pre-existent Being foreordained to the Cross; and their implication becomes almost explicit in *v.*[20]. For although προεγνωσμένου does not necessarily involve pre-existence, since it is used of the readers in *v.*[2], yet φανερωθέντος certainly does. As Hort says, 'taken by itself the word suggests a previous hidden existence, and it was not likely to be chosen except in this implied sense.' Mackintosh summarizes the point thus: 'The person of Christ is already lifted clear of the contingencies of time, viewed as the embodiment of a Divine Spirit, and given a place within the redeeming world-plan of God. More and more the historical is being fused with the eternal.'[1]

This process finds its completion in St. Paul, who widens its scope and interprets it in the categories of the Hellenistic world. For Paul, Christ was the pre-existent Heavenly Man, the Divine Agent in creation, who, though He was in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ), yet emptied Himself (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) and took upon Him the form of a slave (μορφὴ δούλου), and became in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man (σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος), He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross (Ph $2^{6ff.}$). Such is Paul's emphasis upon the Divine Christ that he has been accused of having no interest in the human Jesus: 'What we prize in the man Jesus,' says Wrede, 'plays no part whatever in the thought of the apostle. . . . The "manhood" appears to be a purely formal thing.'[2] It must be remembered, however, that Paul's epistles—with the exception of Romans—are not treatises but letters in which the Christological references are incidental. Moreover, he is writing to people who are acquainted with the facts of Jesus' earthly life, and it is with the redemptive significance of Christ that he is concerned. Nevertheless, it is impossible to deny that the Divine element predominates in the thought of Paul. In Christ is all the πλήρωμα of God (Col 2^{9}), and through Him will be summed up all things both in heaven and upon the earth (Eph 1^{10}). But Paul refrains from calling Christ 'God,' and appears to definitely subordinate Him to the Father (1 Co 3^{23} 6^{14} 8^{6} $15^{24.\ 28}$, Ph 2^{9}, Col 1^{19}).

If, however, St. Paul tends to over-emphasize Christ's divinity, the balance is restored by the emphasis upon His humanity which is seen in the parallel line of development represented by the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here Christ is the great High Priest who by His mediation leads men into the world of eternal reality. But as Priest He must not only have access to God (He 4^{14} 9^{24}), but must also be identified with men. By partaking of flesh and blood He became one with His brethren (He 2^{9-18}); He was 'touched with the feeling of our infirmities'; 'was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (He 4^{15}); He 'learned obedience by the things which He suffered' (He 5^{8}). In short, whatever else Jesus may have been, He was fully and empirically man.

In the Johannine writings, as in Paul, while Christ's human and divine attributes are both acknowledged, the emphasis falls on the divine. In the Apocalypse not only are the attributes of God ascribed to Christ, but the heavenly throne is the throne of God *and of the Lamb* (Rev 22^{3}; cf. 7^{17}). On the other hand the First Epistle of John is anxious to maintain the fact that 'Jesus Christ is come in the flesh' (1 Jn $4^{2.\ 3}$ 5^{6}) over against the Docetic heresy which denied His real humanity. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel, as we have already seen, was One who experienced weariness at the well, sorrow at Lazarus' grave, and thirst on the Cross (Jn $4^{6.\ 7}$ 11^{35} 19^{28}); He was not immune from inner conflict (Jn 12^{27}); He acknowledged His dependence upon God (Jn 11^{41} $5^{19.\ 36}$). But it is the conception of His unique Sonship which dominates the Gospel (Jn 20^{31}; cf. $3^{11.\ 32.\ 35.\ 36}$ 4^{34} $8^{26.\ 38.\ 40}$ 14^{7-13} 15^{15}). While it is true that ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, the eternal, pre-existent λόγος is the Agent (Jn 1^{7} 8^{58}).

IV. The Definition of Chalcedon.

We shall not attempt to survey the Christological controversies of the next four centuries

[1] See H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ*, 45–46.

[2] Wrede, *Paul*, 89.

which culminated in the Definition of Chalcedon (451). Here the principles of all orthodox Christologies were laid down. The full divinity of Christ was asserted against Arianism and His full humanity against Apollinarianism. The unity of His Person was maintained against Nestorianism, yet the permanence of the two natures against Eutychianism.

V. A Modern Christology.

This Chalcedonian Definition does not, of course, solve the problem; it merely states it. The categories of οὐσία and φύσις are all but meaningless for us to-day. Nevertheless all that a modern Christology can do is to restate these fundamental principles in the language of to-day and attempt to relate them the one to the other. But the problem itself it cannot solve; the antinomy remains.

1. The Jesus we know to-day is the Christ of experience. He is the object of our faith through which we have fellowship with Him. But as such He has for us 'the religious value of God'; we recognize Him as the object of our worship; His re-creating work in our lives is nothing less than the work of God. Hence our first postulate regarding the Person of Christ must be that He as we know Him is Divine. But Godhead as such is essentially eternal. It can neither be created *ex nihilo* nor can it be attained. Hence the assertion of Christ's divinity has as its corollary the implication of His pre-existence from all time.

2. But the Christ of experience is mediated to us historically. 'I have immediate communion with my friend,' says Mackintosh, 'yet all I know of him—all our bygone talk, meetings, mutual service—are present in that communion to make it what it is: its present is mediated through its past. So too the relation of the Christian to Christ because personal is direct; none the less, however, it is dependent on the facts of history. Save on the basis of His recorded life, fellowship with Him is meaningless. Nothing else will keep the Christian religion true to type.'[1] As we have seen, however, the Jesus of history, while mediating God Himself and possessing a filial consciousness which can only be described as unique, was nevertheless fully and unequivocally man. Not only was He possessed of a human body and the mind of a Jew of His time, but His whole life was characterized by utter dependence upon God.

From time to time motives of reverence have tended to obscure this real humanity of Christ. Docetism stripped Him of a real body and Apollinarius surrendered His human mind. But if Christ be not completely man the Incarnation is a myth; God has not really stooped to us and become one of us. Moreover the Atonement is incomplete; no sacrifice for sins has been offered *on behalf of humanity*. Further, the manhood of Jesus is necessary if His earthly life is to have any meaning for us. Without it His moral struggles are unreal. To take it away is to reduce His prayer life to mere play-acting and rob His example of all motive power. Not only so, but our guarantee of life after death is gone.

3. Nevertheless nothing is more alien to the data both of experience and of history than to postulate in Christ, as did Nestorianism, a dual personality. The Gospels know nothing of two spheres of consciousness or two wills. Whatever else may be said of the personality of Jesus, however beyond the bounds of definition it may be, one thing is certain—it is a unified personality.

But here we reach the crux of the whole matter; where was the centre of His personality, in the human or the divine? Where must we locate the 'ego' in this God-Man? Is it possible to steer a middle course without falling into the Scylla of Adoptionism or the Charybdis of Apollinarianism? We must choose, so it seems, between two views of the Incarnation. Either we must explain it by some form of Kenosis, in which case the centre of personality must be sought in the Divine Being who 'emptied Himself,' or we must adopt the interpenetration theory of Dorner in which the receptive human 'ego' is permeated by the divine life of God. It is difficult, however, if not impossible, to reconcile this latter theory with the eternal pre-existence of Christ which faith, as we have seen, ultimately demands. As Mackintosh remarks, 'It was because deity was His from before all time that He possessed the unspeakable gift to lay on love's altar.'[2] Hence we are thrown back upon Kenosis in some form; a self-limitation of the eternal Christ. This, however, does not necessarily involve Thomasius' arbitrary distinction between 'internal' and 'external' attributes of the Godhead; the former ones of power, truth, holiness and love being retained, and the latter—omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience—abandoned. If with Forsyth and Mackintosh we reject this distinction as artificial and couple πλήρωσις with κένωσις we shall arrive at a view of the Incarnation which does justice not only to the facts of history and experience, but also to the inner life of Jesus in so far as the latter can be known to us.

The view here advocated is summarized succinctly by Mackintosh: 'It is possible,' he says, 'to conceive the Son, who has entered at love's behest on the region of growth and progress, as now possessing *all* the qualities of Godhead in the

[1] *Op. cit.*, 380 f.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 424.

form of concentrated potency rather than of full actuality, δυνάμει rather than ἐνεργείᾳ.'[1] The κένωσις thus becomes a pre-temporal act of self-limitation whereby 'actuality' is reduced to 'potency'; but this κένωσις has as its complement a πλήρωσις beginning probably at His baptism and consummated in His resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand. In the course of His human development the Man Jesus appropriates such of these latent powers as are necessary for the fulfilment of His vocation in the world.

It remains now to relate this theory to the unique filial consciousness of Jesus to which, as we have seen, the Synoptic records bear witness. The Incarnation involved a human birth and infancy; hence κένωσις meant the laying aside even of self-consciousness when the eternal Son took the form of an unborn babe. But the child grew and consciousness dawned—a human consciousness conditioned by the surroundings of an earthly life. A sense of vocation, however, is often present to a child in early days, and there is no good reason to doubt St. Luke's statement that the boy Jesus, even at the age of twelve, was conscious of a filial relationship to God. We do not say, be it noted, a unique filial relationship, since we may well suppose that Jesus in His early life predicated such a relationship to all men, and only gradually and painfully awoke to the fact that others were not as He. His consciousness of unique Sonship thus developed out of His sense of isolation in this world of men; He was in the world, but not of it. Once this fact had been apprehended it was but a step to the realization of all that it implied.

This is as far as we can see into the mystery of God manifest in the flesh. The mind of man is inadequate to grasp its full significance or to fathom its infinite depths. Each generation must modify the work of the past and contribute its share in the interpretation of this ever-challenging Person, but the Man Christ Jesus remains, and will remain, inexplicable. Christology has been aptly likened to a great cathedral: 'It is ever beautiful for worship, great for service, sublime as a retreat from the tumult of the world, and it is for ever unfinished.'

[1] *Ib.*, 477.

Literature.

ANGLICANISM AND SOUTH INDIAN UNION.

Canon Leonard Hodgson, the Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford, and well known as a leader in the Faith and Order Movement, has just published a pamphlet with the title *Anglicanism and South India* (Cambridge University Press; 1s. net). It is not altogether new, having been originally published five years ago, but it is now re-issued 'in a revised and enlarged version as a contribution to the present discussions' on Union in South India. The pamphlet's primary aim is to expound the 'theological principle' upon which the apostolic succession and the consequent refusal by the Church of England of intercommunion are based. Having dealt with that subject Canon Hodgson proceeds to ask whether, since 'theological principle' forbids the Anglican 'to equate episcopal and non-episcopal ministries,' this involves as a consequence a refusal 'to regard the sacraments of non-episcopal bodies as in every way equal to our own.' His answer is emphatic. 'To think or speak depreciatively about their sacraments is a blasphemous contradiction of the most fundamental theological principle known to us,' that, namely, of the character of God made known in the Biblical revelation.

Canon Hodgson then goes on to examine the dilemma that thus arises and to consider how it can be solved. That brings him face to face with the South Indian situation and he asks whether participation in the proposed union there would involve disloyalty to Anglican theological principles. This part of his argument is of much interest, especially, no doubt, to Anglicans whose dilemma this primarily is, but indeed to all those for whom the effort to bring about union in South India has so much significance. There is no ambiguity in his statement of his own attitude to this scheme. 'Having given such consideration as I am able to the proposals contained in the South India Scheme,' he says, 'I have come to the conclusion that they merit the whole-hearted approval of loyal Anglicans who wish to see their Church fulfil the obligations and rise to the responsibilities of its catholic heritage. It is for the Indians to decide. If they decide to go ahead, I hope the Church of England will cheer them on.'

It is greatly to be hoped that this pronouncement by one whose judgment must carry weight within the Church of England will have an influence in overcoming the hostility to the Scheme which seems to have lately flared up within that Church both in India and in Great Britain. It will be remembered that after deliberations which have gone on for over twenty years it was agreed a year ago to put to the test of a vote by the three negotiating churches the very large measure of agreement reached, and, if union was accepted, to continue such discussions as may still be re-

quired within the united Church. That vote is now being taken in India and has revealed both on the side of the 'Anglican' Church in India and on the side of the South India United Church disagreements which may yet prevent the achievement of the union so patiently worked for and so deeply desired.

The South India United Church is not unanimous in its acceptance of the Scheme though at least five of its eight Councils have voted in favour of it. It may be, however, that the majority necessary in order to allow the Assembly to enter the union will yet be obtained. Even the Synod of the Methodist Church which last year accepted the Scheme whole-heartedly seems now to have found some reason for hesitation.

On the side of 'the Church of India' the discussions in Diocesan Councils in India, as reported in the 'National Christian Council Review' of India, reveal in several cases a sharp division of opinion. This may well be due to a very active agitation against some aspects of the Scheme that has been aroused by some of the Bishops in India and by Anglo-Catholic elements in the Church at home. The doubts that have arisen refer mainly to the arrangements that are proposed—with a view to satisfying tender consciences—during the thirty-one years' period of transition in the United Church. There are, no doubt, some Nonconformist diehards on the one side and some militant Anglo-Catholics on the other who are imparting what may appear to others to be their prejudices rather than their principles into the debate and who are forgetting what Canon Hodgson so frankly and so wisely recognizes, that 'it is for Indians to decide.'

The line of objection taken by the British Anglo-Catholics is indicated by a letter that appeared in the *Guardian* signed by sixty-six Anglican clergy. They accuse 'those in authority' of being apparently willing 'to jettison the historic principle of the Church of England in matters both of Faith and Order.' The Union Scheme, they maintain, 'seems to obliterate the historic status of the Episcopate as the only authoritative legislature in the Church and to deny the necessity of the historic three-fold ministry.' They also assert that Confirmation is reduced 'to the level of an optional alternative to the services of admission to full membership, current among non-Episcopal bodies.' The spirit shown in this letter is far indeed from that of Canon Hodgson and its intransigence would be fatal to any plan of union likely to win acceptance. Fortunately it has received from the Bishop of Gloucester a reply characteristically forthright and decisive. 'Our Church,' he says, 'bids us not to consider anything necessary which has not the authority of Scripture. I find no Scriptural authority for these meticulous demands. The Council of Chalcedon anathematizes not only those who refuse to accept the Christian creed but also those who add to the Faith. It is because so many Christian bodies have confused their prejudices with the Christian Faith that the divisions of Christendom have arisen.' Another critic of the Scheme who joins in the debate is Lord Quickswood (Lord Hugh Cecil).

Still another and a more serious difficulty has more recently arisen. Its seriousness is due to the fact that it is 'a provisional ruling' by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself on the section of the Scheme for union which is called the 'Gentlemen's Agreement.' It deals with the situation of vacant charges formerly Anglican, during the interim period before episcopal ordination has become universal. In an address to the Convocation of Canterbury in May the Archbishop makes this statement: 'I am prepared to say without hesitation that when the Lambeth Conference of 1930 encouraged the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to go forward with the Scheme, it certainly interpreted that section as meaning that a non-episcopally-ordained minister would not be appointed to the charge of a previously Anglican church except in the rarest circumstances which would be such as to afford a manifest ground for conceptional action.'

That seems to some in the other negotiating Churches to be a statement which relegates their ministry to a lower grade than that of the Church of England. It may be that the difficulty can be surmounted by some plan of mutual recognition such as is being considered in the union discussions between the Churches in Iran. Further delay will certainly be necessary and negotiations will have to be resumed.

Thus the fate of a Scheme which may well be considered to be a test case by which the prospects of union with the Church of England may be determined for many years to come hangs in the balance. The South Indian negotiations around which so many hopes and so many prayers have centred will surely not be allowed to fail through the intervention of a narrow section of those who are far removed from the perils and anxieties of the Indian churches; nor yet of those who are imparting the bitterness of British ecclesiastical experience into the Indian situation. That Dr. Temple is unsympathetic to this union cannot be suggested and it would be tragic indeed if his ruling should bring the negotiations to an end. He makes it clear indeed that the decision does not rest with him or with the Church of England. 'It is,' as Canon Hodgson says, 'for the Indians to decide.' But one would like to hear Dr. Temple going on to say with the Canon, 'If they decide to go ahead, I hope the Church of England will cheer them on.' If five years ago the representatives of the younger churches at Tambaram were urgent in their demand for a united front, how much more must that urgency be felt to-day, and especially in India.

NICOL MACNICOL.

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

Dr. Claude Beaufort Moss, who has lectured for many years to Anglican candidates for ordination, has written an elaborate book entitled *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (S.P.C.K.; 16s. net). It is based on his class lectures, and retains the usual form of

lectures destined to be reproduced in students' notebooks. At any rate such lectures should be, as these must have been, orderly, balanced, and comprehensive, not to say clearly punctuated in style and rigorously purged of repetition. The students who attended these lectures must have taken from the classroom a solid body of useful instruction and a definite impression of what Christian Theology is, when presented from a conservative Anglican standpoint.

For Dr. Moss is faithful to the teaching of the Catholic Church as it is interpreted by the Church of England. It is enough to turn to his expositions of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord to see that he will have no traffic with the liberal theology which claims, and has been conceded, standing-room within the Church of England. It is enough to turn to his discussion of the Anglican Communion to see how profoundly thankful to Providence he is to have been placed in it, and how convinced he is that it satisfies the tests of right faith, historical succession, jurisdiction, and activity or growth.

It should be added that he tries to deal fairly with other religious systems than the Anglican, and more especially the Presbyterian. But he is very firm and incisive in his contention that the difference between the Anglican Communion and the Reformed Churches is not about government but about doctrine. Any scheme of union between them must recognize this. A united Christendom without priest, altar, and Mass is inconceivable; a ministry recognized by all Christendom must derive its authority from apostolic succession. That being so, 'reconciliation' must be made by the Reformed Churches not only with the Anglican Communion but with the whole Catholic Church. It looks as though the Reformed Churches had better—on this standpoint—wait upon the union of Greeks, Romans, and Anglicans before seeking to make 'reconciliation.' W. FULTON.

Aristotle's Ethic for English Readers, translated by Mr. H. Rackham, M.A. (Blackwell; 4s. 6d. net), is a very useful piece of work. For common the translator of any classic is torn between the desire to adhere closely to the original and the wish to render it into idiomatic English. The present translator, who has previously given an English version of the Ethics 'designed to assist the student in reading the Greek text,' has now given a freer rendering for the purely English reader. 'Little attempt has been made to convey to English readers the impression of Aristotle's style, the object in view has been to give the substance of his thought in plain English.' In this, it must be said, a high degree of success has been attained. The result has been to give us a most readable account of the Ethics in good, free, flowing English.

Swanland Congregational Church in East Yorks, founded in 1693, has now two and a half centuries of honourable history behind it. To commemorate this important event the present minister, the Rev. John George Patton, has written *A Country Independent Chapel* (Brown & Sons; 7s. 6d. net). The book is much more than a history of the congregation. It is a chronicle of the village from the earliest times, and as such it has very considerable local interest and value. It is written with clarity and good feeling, and is a record of which any church might be proud. Here is nothing sensational but an inspiring record of true piety and of faithful and energetic service. It is a story worthy of being widely read.

In a little book, *Fresh Courage Take*, edited by Miss Dorothy Angus (Carey Press; 1s. net), we have interesting accounts of the work done by women in China in connexion with the Baptist Missionary Society. The material for the book has been supplied by missionaries in the field. It is encouraging to learn that the Protestant churches in China co-operate through the National Christian Council, and that many of them are bound more closely together as the Church of Christ in China. About one thousand churches connected with fourteen missionary societies, including Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, belong to this union. How is it that the missionaries abroad are able to effect unions without serious difficulties which baffle us at home?

'That Thy Faith Fail Not,' by Chris H. Tice (Epworth Press; 1s. net), is described in the subtitle as 'More Talks on Discipleship.' It is a sequel to 'Conscious Discipleship' which is a little 'manual of preparation for Church membership.' Here the writer develops the same theme and discourses to young disciples with great good sense and attractiveness on such themes as the Challenge of To-day, Courage, Knowledge, Money, The Way of the Cross, etc. The little book is full of sound Christian teaching and wise moral guidance fitly expressed.

A little book of quite special interest has come to hand, *Readings from Holy Scripture for the Jewish Membews of His Majesty's Forces*, selected and annotated by the Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, C.H., and issued from his London Office. These readings are, of course, exclusively taken from the Old Testament and are singularly well chosen. One misses the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and some of the great Psalms like the forty-sixth, but on the whole here is the cream of the Old Testament. For those, whether Jews or Christians, who wish to savour the spiritual riches of the Old Testament nothing finer could be recommended. The publication of this little book is a reminder of how many Jews are fighting on the side of the Allies.

The Rev. Stewart W. Herman was pastor of the American Church in Berlin for the six years immediately preceding America's entrance into the war. Under the title of *It's Your Souls We Want* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) he has written a detailed account of his experiences, and

especially of the prolonged conflict between the Nazi system and the Christian Church. His account generally confirms what was already known, but the narrative, which is well written, orderly, and illuminating, has all the value of first-hand evidence. Certain broad conclusions are made clear. There was no popular enthusiasm for war among the German people in 1939 as there was in 1914. 'Most of them suffered from an emotional confusion of admiration and shame and terror at the piratical policy which was being followed so successfully by their ruthlessly clever leader.' As for the Church, 'it may be said that the German army for the first time in its history has marched into war without the blessing of the German Church.' This is hardly to be wondered at when the hostility of the Nazi leaders to the Christian Faith has been so unmistakably expressed in word and action. The writer describes with admiration 'the heroic fight which the Church has waged against crushing odds,' and he concludes that 'it is impossible to heap too much credit upon the German Church, regardless of its mistakes and indecisions. For fighting Hitlerism with all its strength it deserves, in my opinion, a seat among the United Nations.' This is a book which ought to be read by all who wish to reach a clear and well-balanced view of religious and political life in Germany.

Clubs and camps for youth are a distinctive feature of our national life to-day, and the importance of giving due place in them to the element of worship is increasingly felt. Accordingly *Epilogues for Youth*, by Mr. Jack Singleton, B.A., and Mr. R. G. Martin, M.A. (Religious Education Press; 1s. 6d. net), will be warmly welcomed by many. These Epilogues, thirty in number, follow somewhat unconventional lines, avoiding ordinary forms of prayer and classic models, but they are fresh and arresting, and are well fitted to secure reality in worship and to identify Christianity with everyday life and its activity.

A Book of Comfort for the Bereaved, by Mr. Eric Parker (Seeley Service; 6s. net), is a really fine anthology of short passages in prose and verse fitted to cheer the bereaved and sustain them in faith and hope. There are over two hundred of these passages, mostly drawn from modern writers. The first and longest section, entitled 'Into Battle,' is itself a treasure-house for these times of war. It contains some of the finest passages from Donald Hankey, Rupert Brooke, and Herbert Asquith. Other sections of the book are Children, Husband and Wife, Friends, Two Worlds, etc. Curiously enough, while there are a dozen quotations from Mrs. Browning, there are none from that great Christian and optimist, her husband. The book though small is rich in content and being beautifully bound should form an acceptable gift to the bereaved.

At a time when both the content and the methods of education are much in people's minds, and in particular the place of religion in the educational process is widely canvassed, a book on *Public School Divinity*, by Canon J. L. C. Dart (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), will be welcomed. It is described as 'a syllabus of Religious Teaching with Notes' and is the result of experience as chaplain in a great public school. Obviously he found 'divinity' imperfectly taught, not from lack of interest or goodwill but because the system was badly designed. He was in this way driven to make his own syllabus. And at any rate it has a definite conception behind it. The author does not believe in teaching by books of the Bible but by subjects, and this conviction has shaped the syllabus he has produced. There will be differences of opinion as to the value of his idea. Is this syllabus of subjects better than the Oxford or Cambridge Handbooks? Whatever be the verdict on that point, it must be said that the scheme before us in this book has very great merits. It carries us through much of Scripture, and it sets before the young mind all the big things on which it needs instruction. Of course, much depends on how these subjects are taught. But the whole course here presented may be warmly commended to teachers for consideration and experiment.

It is perhaps a significant sign of grace that so many books on prayer are being written, compiled and published. The most recent is one of the best, *The School of Prayer*, by Miss Olive Wyon (S.C.M.; 6s. net). It is addressed specially to two groups of people: first, those who are puzzled about prayer and would like to try it seriously, and, secondly, those who have made efforts and have been discouraged by their experiences. And behind the book lie certain basic assumptions: *first*, that prayer and a living faith are inseparable; *secondly*, that there is an alarming discrepancy between theory and practice; and, *thirdly*, that although prayer is an intensely *personal* matter, it is not individualistic. It is in itself an expression of community, of spiritual fellowship within the Body of Christ.

These preliminaries are the groundwork or the background of the whole book. In successive chapters it deals with the Nature and Object of Prayer, Prayer and Life, Hindrances to Prayer, Prayer and Worship, the Bible and Prayer. And the two groups whom the writer has in mind will find here light and stimulus, comfort and good direction.

The Detective Novel and the Preacher.

By the Reverend Ronald W. Thomson, Burton-on-Trent.

Philip Guedalla once said that 'the detective story is the normal recreation of noble minds.' It is a well-known fact that eminent cabinet ministers and professors read them eagerly. It is suspected that clergymen and ministers of religion represent a great proportion of the readers of this class of literature. Indeed have we not a certain amount of evidence in the fact that Dr. Moffatt wrote one, and Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson was once guilty of a mock, but very acute, examination place-list of detective story authors?

It has been left to Mr. C. Day Lewis, the son of a clergyman, and one of the foremost of our younger poets, to call attention to a certain religious significance in the detective story. Mr. C. Day Lewis has written an introduction to the English edition of an American book called *Murder for Pleasure. The Life and Times of the Detective Story*—a book which is a full-length study of the detective story. Mr. Lewis is well qualified to write such an introduction, for he writes it under his pseudonym of Nicholas Blake. As Nicholas Blake Mr. Lewis will be known to tens of thousands, whereas in his normal self as C. Day Lewis he has only 'slain his thousands.' As Nicholas Blake he has given us some outstanding detective yarns; *The Beast Must Die* is thought by many to be his *magnum opus*. He has also achieved prominence as a brilliant reviewer of this class of fiction.

Now Mr. Lewis in his introduction to *Murder for Pleasure* has indulged in a flight of fancy. He has pictured some Frazer of the far distant future investigating the myths of the twentieth century, and seizing upon the crime fiction of the time as an outlet for the religious instinct of man, an instinct which was not finding its expression in institutional forms of religion. 'When,' he says, 'religion has lost its hold upon men's hearts they must have some other outlet for the sense of guilt.'

Mr. Lewis elaborates his theme. He asserts that the pattern of the detective story is as highly formalized as any religious ritual. There is sin. There is the victim of sin. There is the high priest—the criminal. And a higher power which ultimately destroys the high priest of sin—the detective. And finally we have in the denouement—the Day of Judgment. Mr. Lewis also sees religious significance in that the reader identifies himself with both the murderer and the detective, and that the identification represents the light and the dark side of his own nature. He maintains therefore that the detective novel fulfils a function of religion in taking the burden of guilt off the shoulders of the individual.

One wonders how much of all this Mr. Lewis wrote with his tongue in his cheek. As perhaps he did on another occasion when he asserted that he enjoys writing detective stories because they are 'a harmless release of an innate spring of cruelty.' On the other hand he is always aware in his more serious writings of the conflict between the dark and the light side of human nature. He feels himself to be the battlefield of such a conflict:

> As one between two massing powers I live
> Whom neutrality cannot save
> Nor occupation cheer.

Apart from Mr. C. Day Lewis' attempt to explain the religious significance of the detective story, and to find an explanation of its vast popularity—I should like him to have continued his essay in another way. For it would be possible to find significance in other features of this form of fiction. There is the fact that the public demands the maintenance of law and order. Arsene Lupin, who started as a criminal character, had gradually to be changed into a reformed man openly on the side of law. Joshua Clunk, a hymn-singing scoundrel—the second detective created by H. C. Bailey—has never achieved the popularity of Mr. Bailey's major detective, Mr. Fortune. And is there not a deep moral significance in the fact that the totalitarian states have produced little detective literature, and have banned English and American samples. The late Lord Chief Justice Hewart said bluntly that 'the detective story, as distinct from the crime story, flourishes only in a settled community where the readers' sympathies are on the side of law and order.' The preacher cannot fail to be interested in books like those of Francis Iles, where the story is told from such an angle that the reader is left feeling 'There but for the grace of God go I.' Nor can he refuse to see his own themes worked out by the French author Simenon, in whose stories evil seems to darken the very air, and yet carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. One could also find within the realm of detective literature much that is pertinent to the preacher in other ways, for instance, in his method of going about his task. I can see at least four points worth mentioning, two of them are tendencies which are dangerous for both the detective novelist and the preacher, and two are assets in both of these men.

For instance, there is the way several of the finest detective story writers have spoiled themselves by pretentiousness. 'S. S. Van Dine' was one of the most popular of American writers. His first novels, *The Benson Murder Case* and *The Canary Murder Case*, were notable for brilliant plots, and impressive cleverness on the part of the detective. But in time the wit and brilliance of the detective, Philo Vance, became more and more obtrusive and less agreeable. That which in earlier tales had been a help to the plots was later thrown in without any essential relationship to them. And for that reason the author's books lost their power. In England the same thing was beginning to happen in regard to Dorothy Sayers, until she turned from detective literature to writing

religious drama and theology. *Gaudy Night* disappointed many of its readers because of its excess of erudition. It is true that with this book Miss Sayers was probably deliberately attempting a new type of detective fiction, but as a friend of mine put it, the public does not like 'too much love, too much Oxford, and not enough detection.' Some readers detect the same tendency in a younger writer, 'Michael Innes.' This Professor of English, when he turns to writing detective stories, can allow his erudition to run away with him. The true power of the author is smothered by a mass of literary quotations.

Dr. David Christie in his valuable little book *The Service of Christ* has some biting things to say about the same temptation as it affects the preacher; he calls it the temptation to shine. It is one of the big temptations of the pulpit. A peril that meets us from the very day of our ordination is to attempt to impress by a display of fireworks, only to blot out the stars. We try to vie with the cinema in attractive titles and novelty, and it impresses no one. There is an exercise every preacher might try—and that is to go through his prepared sermon and strike out all the 'impressive' parts, the resounding passages. We all put them in, and we weaken our power by so doing. There is a lesson to be learned from Flecker, who wrote that moving little poem beginning:

> A linnet who had lost her way
> Sang on a blackened bough in Hell.

In the first draft of that poem the gaunt starkness is missed. But Flecker pruned it, and this was what he did, from each of eight lines he removed one word, and in six instances the word he removed was an adjective. It is not alone the poet who can improve his work by pruning, by eliminating the unnecessary adjective, the pretentiousness.

One of the greatest dangers of the detective story writer, as of all popular authors, has been the temptation to produce such a quantity of work that his quality deteriorates. When Conan Doyle wrote *A Study in Scarlet* (and incidentally had to sell it outright in disgust for a sum of £25), he established a pattern for the detective story which was to endure for many years. The success of his next book *The Sign of Four* started him upon his career, and tale followed tale. Several times Conan Doyle tried to rid himself of Sherlock Holmes. Finally he killed him, but had to restore him to life because of the public outcry. But Doyle knew where wisdom lay. He should have left Holmes in his grave, for gradually the quality of his stories deteriorated. A more modern example of this is to be seen in the career of Edgar Wallace. In twenty-seven years he produced one hundred and fifty separate books, to say nothing of plays and short stories. He squandered his undoubted gifts, for most of his stories are marred by hasty writing.

If such can be true of the author who produces a hundred or so stories, what of the preacher who week by week produces his sermons? Apart from the problem of sermons I am convinced that the clergyman and minister to-day is beset by a grave peril, that of scattering his energies over a multiplicity of interests. Long ago Dr. Jowett said to the students at Yale, 'Gentlemen we are not always doing the most business when we seem to be most busy.' We might wriggle out of some of our tasks, but we cannot evade the sermon. All the more need therefore that we should strive continually to keep up its quality. We must fight to safeguard our hours in the study; and to make the study not merely a workshop but an 'upper room.' In abundant and intimate fellowship with our Saviour alone can the miracle happen—and sermon follow sermon, week after week, year after year, each one notable for its quality.

I maintained earlier that a study of the detective story, and the merits of the various authors, brought to light two assets which made for success. The first is seen conspicuously in Miss Dorothy Sayers. Miss Sayers has been called by some critics the greatest of living writers of the detective novel. She has done more than any other to raise this form of novel to the heights of legitimate literature. Now in her *magnum opus, The Nine Tailors,* as also in *Murder Must Advertise,* and to a certain extent in *Gaudy Night,* Miss Sayers achieves her greatness not merely by the brilliance of her plot, the perfection of the detection, or the carefulness of her characterization. She is aided by her painstaking and attractive sketching of a background. Miss Sayers uses her own history, and her wide interests, to build up that background. She was brought up in East Anglia, that is the effective background of *The Nine Tailors.* She attended Somerville College, Oxford, and was one of the first women to take an Oxford degree; Oxford is pictured in *Gaudy Night.* She spent some years in a London advertising agency, an agency appears in *Murder Must Advertise.* Her own history, her many gifts, her many interests, enrich her work. Many other examples could be produced. Miss Ngaio Marsh (one of the newcomers to this form of literature, and one destined to go far) from her personal interests of art and the theatre, and her background of New Zealand, enriches all her work.

I think there is no point in which we preachers differ from one another more than in this—that one man will forswear everything outside the narrow limits of theology. He has no hobbies, no interests in literature, art, or science. Another man has wide interests, and his preaching is fed from all these streams. Every hobby, every casual acquaintance, teems, for him, with illustrations. Is there any doubt which is the better preacher?

My other point is this—the best detective story writing has been done by men who wrote with gusto. The work of that most modern writer—John Dickson Carr—is of this kind. It has an unfailing verve. John Buchan's *Richard Hannay* stories were written in the same spirit. The finest illustration comes from G. K. Chesterton, of whom a delightful story is told. He used to sit writing articles, and his *Father Brown* detective stories, in a certain Fleet Street café, with waiters

hovering round lest he should suddenly want another coffee, or equally suddenly get up and walk out in a fit of abstraction, without paying his bill. One day, one of these waiters said to a friend of Chesterton, 'Your friend he very clever man. He sit and laugh. Then he write. And then he laugh at what he write.' It is significant of the gusto with which Chesterton wrote.

Dr. Phillips Brooks, in his famous *Lectures on Preaching* says that this is the characteristic of the man of whom we say, when we see him in the pulpit, that he is a born preacher. 'It is the quality that kindles at the sight of men, that feels a keen joy at the meeting of truth and the human mind . . . it is the inspiration, the possession—what I have heard called the "demon" of preaching.' Something of this quality should be in us all. This does not mean that we shall always preach in tones of vehement oratory. In some there may be an entire lack of oratory, but if there still shines through an underlying zeal, a deep sincerity, and a fervour for souls, that man will be a preacher indeed. Dr. Johnson once remarked that in the club someone started talking about some extremely prosaic subject, 'whereupon,' said Johnson, 'I withdrew my attention, and thought about Tom Thumb.' When the pew withdraws its attention it is often because the underlying note of urgency, passion, the 'demon' is lacking in the preacher. C. H. Spurgeon once said to his students, 'The heart of preaching is the throwing of the soul into it.'

If an author can write with gusto concerning the tracking down of a criminal, and his delivery to justice, shall not the preacher write and speak with even greater enthusiasm? For he has to declare the work of One who

> . . . . with unhurrying chase,
> And unperturbèd pace,
> Deliberate speed, majestic instancy

seeks the human soul, not that it may be delivered to the grim executioner, but that it shall 'Rise, clasp My hand, and come.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Following the Fashion.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift.'—2 Co 9[15] (R.V.).

One thing that gladdens us all at this season is the getting, and I trust also the giving, of gifts. But why should we give gifts at Christmas? Because God set the fashion for us, when He gave the world what the Bible calls 'his unspeakable gift,' the gift of His only begotten Son, who was born on a starry night at Bethlehem long, long ago.

Others were soon following the fashion, of whom the first were the three wise men. On hearing about this new arrival, who they believed was to be of great importance to mankind, they came with haste to the Bethlehem stable where the child was, guiding themselves by means of the star, and when they reached His presence at length they 'presented unto him gifts,' rare and lovely, of gold and frankincense and myrrh.

As that baby grew up and became a man He Himself followed the fashion of giving. Indeed there never was in all the world a more generous giver. Although it wasn't money He gave, for He never had much, He couldn't see anyone in need without giving whatever He could, His healing and help, His labour and love, His friendship and sympathy. And at last He gave the most precious thing in anyone's power: He actually gave His life for His friends.

And millions since then have gone on trying to follow Him in this fashion of giving. And whatever we may feel like at other times, at this time of the year we all feel, as somebody called it, 'givish,' and though perhaps we haven't any 'great possessions,' like the rich young ruler had, we are anxious and glad to give what we can. A true story is told of one small girl who was very anxious to give. It was at a service at a Christian Sunday School in China. On Christmas Sunday the children brought gifts, to be given out afterwards to the needy. A penny perhaps, a piece of silver, a pair of socks, or some other thing—the tiny tots trotted up with them to the altar. At last everyone seemed to have given, but the Superintendent, not wishing anyone to be left out, asked, 'Is there anyone else who has a gift?' At that there was a movement and a poor little Chinese slave-girl plucked up her courage, unwound a cotton scarf from her neck, came shyly forward, and laid it upon the pile of gifts. I think there were tears in the eyes of the angels at that gift

And I want to say this to end with, that even if we seem to have nothing worth giving we can still follow the fashion and give the Great Giver something He craves above everything else.

Over that great South American land of Brazil there once were kings, and the name of the last Brazilian king was Dom Pedro, a very good man. Although it was no fault of his own, Dom Pedro was forced to resign and had to seek refuge abroad. It so happened that he had his birthday on board the ship. Usually on such an occasion the family had gifts to give him. Unfortunately in their hurry none had taken any with them, so they wrote him letters instead to show him their love. One that gave him particular pleasure was a note

written by his three small grandsons, which simply said :

'Dear Grandpapa,—We have no flowers for you to-day, but we give you our hearts.—Your little ones who love you very much.'

It was indeed a tender thought. And He, too, who once gave His all for us, He wants and will value most of all the gift of our hearts.

A Story of the Chief Scout.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'Be pitiful, be courteous.'—1 P 3^{8}.

The other day I heard a gentleman recount to a meeting at which Lady Baden-Powell was present an incident of his boyhood which he said he had never told before. When he was at school he began at one time to collect autographs. It was forty years ago and the great popular hero of the day was Baden-Powell, the defender of Mafeking and afterwards the founder of the Boy Scouts. Greatly daring he wrote a very polite letter to him asking if he would be so very kind as send him his autograph or signature for his collection. And to his delight and pride he received an answer which ran like this: 'Dear boy, I have much pleasure in complying with your request, yours sincerely, R. S. Baden-Powell.' It was a splendid treasure for his collection.

Now he had a chum, a rather cheeky little boy, who always imitated people, and this chum thought he would begin an autograph collection too; and he also wrote to Baden-Powell. The answer he got was something like this, 'Dear Boy, your letter is carelessly written and badly spelt and the stamp is stuck on squint. In those circumstances I can only sign myself, yours sincerely, R. S. B.-P.'

That was a crusher. But what did this cheeky little fellow do but write back: 'Dear General Baden-Powell, I got your rotten beastly letter and tore it up. I am not collecting initials but only proper signatures.'

His friend thought that if Baden-Powell took any notice at all of this rude epistle it would be to send it to the headmaster to have the boy punished for impertinence; but what happened was this. Another letter came from Baden-Powell which ran thus: 'Dear Boy, I am very sorry I have hurt your feelings. I wrote as I did to point out to you that carelessness in little things while a boy is important for it may form a habit of being careless which will matter very much when you are grown up and have big things in charge. I now sign myself with best wishes, yours sincerely, R. S. Baden-Powell.'

And then followed a postscript. 'P.S.—In case you may not like to put this whole letter for people to see in your collection I enclose my signature on a separate sheet.'

There are many good lessons in that story. Perhaps the finest is in the kindness of Baden-Powell. He was kind to send autographs at all. And very kind and courteous to say he was sorry he had hurt that angry little boy's feelings and write that wise letter of explanation. And how thoughtfully kind to understand that the lad might be ashamed to show the letter, and would like the signature by itself. If one wishes a text to go with this story is not this the right one, Peter's words, 'Be pitiful, be courteous'?

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

Suspense Complains of a Slow-footed Deliverance.

'Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?'—Mt 11^{3}.

John the Baptist had hailed Jesus as the long-expected Messiah, and why did he swither now? It was because he was sick at heart with delay, tired of waiting for a redemption which never seemed to arrive. Jesus did not appear to spring to the rescue. Like some moderns, John asked why this dearly-trusted fulfilment of hope does not fulfil our hopes on the spot.

1. *What was goading John the Baptist to Impatience?* He was confined in the castle of Machaerus, which was partly a palace and partly a prison. It resembled the castle of Ferrara where the upper apartments were brilliant with 'the strains of music and ceaseless revelry, the ringing of silver plate, the clatter of majolica dishes, and the clinking of Venetian glass,' as Villari relates, while the lower apartments were dungeons where prisoners groaned in their chains; and these contrasts made a painful impression on young Savonarola. The castle of Machaerus also made a painful impression on John, who was incarcerated in its depths. It embodied a vile despotism, which crushed freedom, goodness, and progress; and how long was this despotism to go on and disinherit men from liberty and light? That was what John asked. He had been put under arrest for state reasons, partly because he had condemned Herod's illegal marriage with Herodias and partly (as Josephus says) to preclude the possibility that he might lead a revolution. He was inconvenient to a tyrannical and immoral government; though he was no politician, he was so popular that he might be a dangerous critic of the ruling caste, like Pastor Niemöller. So he was shut up within four walls—a victim of oppression and injustice.

But Jesus did not seem to be coming up to John's expectation. There was no smashing blow against iniquity, there was no instantaneous reckoning with the scoundrels of the time. Why this delay? John was impatient because Jesus did not strike down arrogant sins at once. We have sometimes shared his mood when we hear of the latest Nazi turpitude, and wonder how long this record of crime is going to last. Is Jesus the promised Saviour after all? A modern novelist puts the opinion into the mouth of one of his characters, a young man in a sordid Scottish village: 'If God had meant to save the world,

He would not have taken so long about it, but would have done it long ago.'

2. *The Reply of Jesus was a Tribute to John.* Jesus' answer paid homage to the great-hearted prisoner, because it took for granted that the Baptist was not a selfish man inquiring, 'What is to become of me?' but a socially-minded man inquiring, 'What is to become of men and women everywhere?' Jesus held that no one is too fine a fellow to suffer for the Kingdom of God and He did not consider Himself too good for the shame and agony of the Cross. No one is too innocent, too lovable, too distinguished to go through red hell to bring the gracious splendour of heaven nearer to mankind. Therefore John would not get off by any spectacular intervention from above, but would have to go on to the grisly end, when his noble head would be presented on a platter to a girl who had provided a glamorous cabaret show to a hiccoughing kinglet and his courtiers. Well, John was too big a soul to complain of that. What he did complain of was that he saw no prospect of victory for the cause.

3. *Jesus produced His Credentials.* His reply to the envoys from John was a reassurance. Jesus claimed that in Him, God had come into history as the supreme power of repair, to restore what had been lost, to retrieve the defeats and frustrations of human society, and to extricate men from their sinful blundering and hopeless misery.

John the Baptist was mistaken in looking for lightning judgments and supposing that the deliverance brought by Jesus was slow-footed. Some might gasp and some might grin if a Divine drama of terrorism against iniquity unfolded itself, but would many be changed in heart? Would they be liberated from the personal sins which contribute to the general devilry in human affairs? Probably not. Accordingly, what Jesus was interested in was not penal displays but sin-stricken persons. The value of persons is the basis of freedom; the rights and liberties of the individual are the root of justice. Field-Marshal Smuts said to the students of St. Andrews not long before the war, 'For me the individual is basic in any world-order that is worth-while. Individual freedom, individual independence of mind, individual participation in the difficult work of government, seems to me essential to all true progress.' To adopt any schematic generalization would produce that dehumanized thing, the mass man, whose personal responsibility is submerged in a centralized control. A planned system is the danger-signal of the present. The individual must not be sacrificed to any standardized regime which becomes soul-less. So the Master dealt with deluded, sinful folk one by one, because it was the only way to save them. Those in suspense might chafe at what seemed a slow-footed deliverance, but our Lord knew that the individual's world must be redeemed by intimate relations with God before the world could be redeemed as a whole.

4. *Is there no immediate Divine Counterstroke to evil?* People are eager to see monstrous wrongs brought to bay and condemned here and now. Will God not strike His blow for the supremacy of spiritual values? Yes. Jesus was aware of a present God, on the spot, achieving His purpose in the teeth of clenched antagonisms. Our Lord spoke words of doom as well as words of comfort and appeal. He left no doubt as to the quite appalling penalties which fall on the impervious and the incorrigible. In this same chapter is His fateful saying: 'And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell. It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee.' That is how Jesus foretold the collapse of the mentality which is adamant against the good.

But someone exclaims, 'There is the maddening defect again, "foretold!"' Why this postponement of nemesis on evil, why this exasperating futurism? To this, our Lord makes a twofold reply. On the one hand, He says, 'Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.' Retribution is not merely future, but present. People are being tried and judged now by their attitude to Jesus Christ, and the position is being cleared up every day.

> She set a rose to blossom in her hair
> The day faith died.
> 'Now glad,' she said, 'and free I go,
> And life is wide.'
> But through long nights she stared into the dark,
> And knew she lied.

Yes, a rejection of Jesus Christ is present retribution. A lost opportunity of yielding to His transforming Mastery is judgment pronounced on the loser, darkening and stunting the nature, and the judgment is not future but present, now, to-day. It has immediate effect on all the contacts of that person, and radiates outward in a baleful circle.

On the other hand, Jesus replies to those who complain of a slow-footed Providence: 'Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe.'

This does not mean that Providence may not intervene in some spectacular and dramatic way to shorten the time of suffering. God is always surprising, and it is the unexpected that happens. But the emphasis of Jesus here is that the future which God intends does not depend on outward events so much as on inward change. People must be moved to think of God and goodness for themselves, 'the blind must receive their sight' and be open-eyed to reality; and they must work out the problems of responsibility on their own and not lie down to them, 'the lame' must walk; the 'lepers,' those who have been a corrupting influence, must be cleansed; 'the deaf,' who are heedless to the call of truth, must be stirred to hear; 'the dead,' the dead heads and the dead hearts, must be raised up and vitalized; 'the poor,' the insignificant and helpless, who have never had a fair chance, must have the gospel preached to them, and there must be good news for all who are down and feel disinherited. All this is what Jesus undertakes as the Saviour, and is achieving by His faithful servants through the centuries.

There are too many who ask nothing bigger than

that we should win the war and win it soon. I am just as anxious as anyone that we should win the war, and win it at the earliest possible date. The winning of the war may be *part* of God's will for us; in my opinion it is; but it is certainly far from being *all* God's will for us.

Have we grasped what Jesus proposes to make the future? It is to be life transformed at its personal centre, a Christian society. His Majesty the King showed his awareness of this in his Christmas Broadcast two years ago, when he said we must learn to make life a worthier thing, to think less of self and more of one another, and by the help of God make our way to justice. Let us think out how far we as individuals are making any contribution to a saved world, and whether we can say from personal experience of Jesus Christ, 'Whereas I was blind to God and His claim, now I see,' 'Whereas I was lame in aspiration, sympathy, and service, now I can walk and get a move on.' [1]

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Man's Day.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE M. DOCHERTY, B.D., SANDYHILLS, GLASGOW.

'. . . they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth.'—Ps $90^{5.6}$.

'That's what human life's like,' says the psalmist. A passing, fleeting day.

The golden evening brightens in the west,
Soon, soon to faithful warriors cometh rest.

And this transience of life is a solemn thought whose truth stabs our wilting minds into action. The years come and go and ever they pass more swiftly. Says A. E. Housman in fine lines,

Now, of my threescore years and ten
Twenty will not come again,
And take from seventy years a score
It only leaves me fifty more.

And since to look on things in bloom
Fifty springs is little room,
About the woodlands I will go
And see the cherry hung with snow.

'They are as grass . . .' is the grave word of the psalmist.

Let us take this universal fact of mankind to Him whose life was so full He had not so much time as to eat. And, as with all our problems, He has an answer. At least, from three incidents in St. Luke some light streams through for us.

There was that day when certain of the Pharisees came to Jesus and said 'Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee.' And the Master's answer to this kindly warning, 'Go ye, and tell that fox [Herod], Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. Nevertheless, I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (Lk 13^{31-3}).

That's not merely defiance, it's faith. Faith to believe that life is not in Herod's hands nor anybody elses, but in the Hand of God. And not even Herod will intervene or meddle with that Providence of the Father. Jesus had work to do, a message to preach, a life to give; but His hour had not yet come. Which explains, partly, His quiet confidence undisturbed by fears or regrets about the evanescence and fugacity of life. He had none of those moments of ours when life's mortality dawns upon us and the fact of death stares us in the face, which we would fain smother behind a chirpy optimism or laugh off with the slap in the back 'Cheer-up-old-man, to-morrow-you-might-be-dead.'

Can we walk as He did? Or what's just as difficult, accept Him at his word? Especially in these days when for the second time in a lifetime so many of our youth, and among the best of them too, have gone out, not counting the cost, and have not come back. Still do you believe Jesus?

Don't press mere man for an answer to that. Here we tread among the deeps of a mystery that lies with God. Yet this much can be said; He who said 'Go tell that Fox Herod . . . to-day I walk . . .' was dead within weeks of that remark; that from the human point of view the whole drama of the Incarnation is that of One cut off in the very prime and flower of manhood with His work apparently hardly begun. Eighteen months of itinerant preaching—then Calvary. Yet, there was that night when He could look over all He had done and pray to God, 'Father I have finished the work Thou hast given me to do.'

All of which means this, if Christ is right, our mistake is in measuring life in terms of time, in length of years, confusing the long life with the fullest; believing, in the agony and darkness of losing someone dear to us, that something has gone wrong with God's will, when it might rather be that something terrible has gone wrong with our plans and dreams and hopes. May it not be, and here one speaks on one's knees, that even they too have completed their work, that into their brief span has been crowded an eternity of life never otherwise possible though they had lived to a hundred and passed on from this earthly scene full of years and wisdom and peace. Heaven forbid that any man glorify war! It is all the waste that Studdert Kennedy says of it:

Waste of manhood, waste of health,
Waste of beauty, waste of wealth,
Waste of ways the saints have trod,
Waste of glory, waste of God.

Yet may it not be that this half-concealed flash of truth from the Gospel assures us we, like Him, have our day to live within the Providence of a loving Heavenly Father, and not even Herod (nor Hitler) can take away one day from its worth in the sight of God. We have our day, and are there not twenty-four hours in it?

Then in St. Luke 19 we read 'Jesus entered and

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Crisis on the Frontier*, 12.

passed through Jericho' thronged with sightseers. Little Zacchaeus no doubt elbowed out of the way in the crowded narrow streets, climbs the sycamore tree to see the Prophet of Nazareth pass. And Jesus saw him. What passed between these two? Had they met before or had Jesus heard of him; or was it that the Master, looking into that face among the opening leaves, beheld the agony of a tormented soul, like the face carved upon the wall of Iona Abbey, with hopelessness and sin and misery written across it? This we do know. Jesus stopped and cried. 'Zacchaeus, make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house.' Not to-morrow, nor the next day nor some day when I pass . . . but to-day. And watch the little fellow free himself from the branches, excitedly clamber down, fight his way through the crush until he stands beside the Prophet of Nazareth. And look at his face as he talks—there's a new light in these eyes, and hope, and we read 'joy.' 'Half my goods I'll give to the poor. If I have assessed any man wrongly, I'll repay him fourfold.'

But if Zacchaeus had delayed coming down from his perch, putting off the invitation with some excuse of embarrassment before so many and so well-known people, or that there was plenty of time, he had lost all hope of salvation and joy, and the glory and adventure of this new life that had been so unexpectedly thrust upon him. For Jesus never passed that way again. There was to be no second chance. He was on his way to Jerusalem—and Calvary.

With us it is just as urgent for life is so fleeting, like grass. . . . Suppose He look at you as at Zacchaeus, making the same demand, what is your reply? St. Patrick's? 'I bind unto myself to-day the strong name of the Trinity.' Or Ebenezer Erskine's? '. . . I take Heaven and earth, men and angels, sun, moon and stars, the stones and timber of this house, to witness that upon these terms I give away my body, soul and estate and all that I am or have been in this world, unto God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.' Or shall we, like the Hebrew slaves of old, offered freedom and liberty after seven years of service, standing before the open door flooded with the light of the rising sun, stop at the threshold, step back and return to the kitchen among the pots and pans of the enslaved confined life—because there is security, the calmness of a stagnant pool; the carefreeness of a cow chewing the cud and, because it has known no other, believing that to be life. 'To-day I must abide at thy house.'

But the third incident is the coping stone for the whole structure. It brings us to the foot of the Cross (Lk 23^{43}). Already the sky lours and amidst all the noise and rabble and laughter and taunts and the weeping anguish of women's voices arises clearly the sob of the penitent thief. Little does he know it is to be his confession of faith! Turning upon his fellow in crime, he cries 'Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss.' Then after a pause, as a drowning man sees his whole life pass before him in a flash, he too sees the road he has travelled, the whole sordid tale right up to this place of a Skull; and grasping at the only piece of wreckage within reach, not indeed daring to hope for anything, perhaps except sympathy, he says, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' Yet back comes the authoritative voice of Jesus (for note the form of the words), 'Verily I say unto you, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

Again it is to-day. To-day, for this man, will see the end of the old life, and freed from the devils of temptation, like the lad of Gadara he shall sit, and in his right mind, as a little child, clothed in such robes as theirs who have come out of great tribulation, before the throne of God. The broken circle of human life as depicted by the Druids is now complete. To-day is eternity in his hands—and in ours too.

Wordsworth tells us in great poetry how at birth

> . . . trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home:
> Heaven lies about us in our infancy!
> Shades of the prison-house begin to close
> Upon the growing Boy.

Until all is forgotten. But it's not true, even though Plato did accept it. And Hood at the end of his day looks at the tangled skein of his life, remembering only the past days of bliss, and sighs out, 'I'm further off from Heaven now than when I was a boy.' But that too is not Christianity. The gospel of Christ is the gospel of Eternal day. 'I believe in the life everlasting.' Not in a darksome purgatory where souls struggle on and on until assisted by the prayers of the living, they come at last to the Gate of Heaven. Not in going out into the darkness of death but the light of life; not to rest and sleep but labour and work, day and night in his Holy Temple. Not in death, stark and irrevocable, but a new beginning; not the white of coffin clothes but the radiant garment of the redeemed of God. And all within the short span of human life!

'They are like grass . . .' but 'The Word of the Lord endureth for ever.' Which for us too is, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Ugliness of Christmas.

BY THE REVEREND HOWARD H. BRYANT, B.Sc.,
NEWTON ABBOT, DEVON.

'And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.'—Lk 2^{7}.

'The angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him.'—Mt 2^{13}.

The story of the first Christmas is the most lovely story the world has ever heard. We have

so often been moved to praise by its simple beauty that it may well seem strange to be called to give thanks for its ugliness. Yet, to-day, that may carry a deeper message to our souls than all its loveliness.

There would seem to be little room for a 'pretty-pretty' Christmas this year. Take a look at the Christmas cards in the shops and in your post—if you begin to think about them they will nearly all bring with them a sense of unreality. Just look at them—peaceful country scenes; trees, hills, streams, and farmsteads—old English streets, with ladies in sedan-chairs or a coach bowling merrily by—Harlequins and Columbines—flowers and tinsel, golliwogs and dolls, nice clean snow and thatched cottages with brightly lighted windows, holly, and robin red-breasts. Even when the artist has turned to Bethlehem for his inspiration, how idyllic the scene generally is—such a well-appointed stable; such nice, clean animals; such an attendant galaxy of neat shepherds, gorgeous kings, and dazzling angels. And if you turn to the verses written inside, only too often they leave you with the same feeling. What on earth has all this to do with the kind of world and times in which we live to-day? It seems to belong to other times and to a different world from ours. What has the Christmas-card Christmas in common with devastated countrysides, a world at war; with shattered homes, scattered families, and all the many pains and sorrows of our present age? The whole thing seems irrelevant and unreal. . . .

With what thankfulness does one turn from this to the real thing, and how different it is! Milton, in his 'Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity,' has pictured that night in words of great beauty:

> No war, or battle's sound,
> Was heard the world around;
> The idle spear and shield were high uphung;
> The hookéd chariot stood,
> Unstained with hostile blood;
> The trumpet spake not to the arméd throng;
> And kings sat still with awful eye,
> As if they surely knew their sovran Lord was by.
>
> But peaceful was the night,
> Wherein the Prince of Light
> His reign of peace upon the earth began. . . .

What beautiful poetry—but is it true? There was no special quietness about that night. The world went on its noisy way as usual, quite unconscious and careless of the event that was happening in Bethlehem. Men loved and quarrelled, bought and sold, slept or watched just as on any other night. Was Herod really sitting still that night, overcome with awe? Not a bit of it—he was following his usual habits and pastimes, knowing nothing of what had occurred. And when he did hear the news that a Prince had been born, his actions were hardly reverential. While he waited to learn where the young King lay, his soldiers stood to arms, ready to pounce and to kill as soon as the place was known. Far from it being a peaceful night, there was probably a great deal of clamour going on no farther away than the inn and its courtyard. Here was an assorted crowd of travellers brought together by an unpopular errand. It was a census for taxation. There is nothing very lovely about taxes at any time, and how hated these must have been—taxes that were to be paid by the Jews to the Gentile occupiers of their own holy land. How heated must have been the arguments, how bitter the curses, how loud the songs put up by those trying to make their merry best of a bad job in the inn that night. And this motley crew—what cared they for what was going on in the smelly little stable at the back? So far were they from standing silent in reverent wonder at the event, that their indifference had crowded Him out into that lowly place among the animals.

We have reason to be thankful to-day for the realism of the New Testament story. It is no affair of tinsel and of paper streamers, belonging to some other world than this. It begins in a stable, with a baby whose life is threatened by a tyrant. It ends, so far as ordinary earthly life is concerned, with a Cross standing in darkness upon a grisly hill. And the path between these two is no affair of fairy palaces, of riches, ease, and glamour. It was a path which, while it touched all the heights and glories of love, joy, and peace, touched too every human depth of disease, poverty, greed, hatred, treachery, lust, and pain.

Here is one of the most essential facts for us to remember in these days. We are so often tempted to look on our religion as something to which we can retire from the buffeting of unpleasant realities. But its story is set right in the midst of *real* human life, with its unpleasant facts as well as its pleasant. I believe that it was certain words of the Archbishop of Canterbury during a recent Christmas that set my mind working along these lines. He said, 'We must avoid at all costs the temptation to make of our Christmas worship a withdrawal from the stress and sorrow of life into a realm of unreal beauty.' Jesus Christ was born into a real world. One of the supreme beauties of Christmas is its ugliness; because in the midst of men's carelessness, strife, and rivalry God was born on earth—because the discerning eye could see Him *there*—because it teaches us that God can be found in what might otherwise be thought (and often are thought) impossible places. It is not only in the lovely places of the world and of life that God is to be found. In the midst of man-made pain and strife God is not absent. He may still be found. Our religion is not something which helps us to run away from the real hard world to God. It is something which helps us to find God in the very midst of that same real hard world. Christmas, the real Christmas, tells us that. Perhaps it tells us more also.

Why was Jesus born in such a place? Why did not God choose some lovely, quiet, safe place for the gift of something so very precious? Was it not because Jesus was His answer to men's appalling need? And so He was born in such surroundings because that was where He was *needed* most. And so it still is to-day. One may find

Him in the midst of all loveliness—yes—but to the souls of those who understand the Christmas message, He is nearest of all in the place and in the day when most we need Him.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Past a Pledge for the Future.

BY THE REVEREND R. E. McINTYRE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us.'—Lk 2^{15}.

Christmas is still, as in the beginning, a season of song, of gladness, of angels. Though we have had the angel-visits so often, we are not wholly beyond the surprise of their coming. How astonishing that so many should remember us, and be at pains to testify their good-will. 'Fancy him thinking of me!' And there are the angels within, rousing affections in us, aspirations, recollections that despite the buffeting of life are not dead but alive. We are still surprised at the things we and our friends go out of our usual way to say and do because of Christmas and its inspiration.

After all such surprising seasons, however, comes the ebbtide when the waters withdraw to leave the unbared rocks and the widespread mud-flats. In face of these we wonder whether we ever had any visitation, saw any vision, heard any song. That mood follows every high season of the soul. When Christmas has passed, and the angels are gone away, how empty the sky seems, how downcast and limp we feel.

Against the cynicism of that currish mood, that 'power of the dog' which the psalmist knew and feared, four provisions can be made.

1. The first is suggested by the fact that whatever their after-mood might be, the shepherds' previous experience was real and very great. And however bleak our day is now, we should be grateful that only yesterday sunbeams were dancing upon the face of our waters. The gloom of January does not make unreal the brightness of Christmas. If the angels have now gone away, we had their visit; they were real, and the experience they brought was great and true.

Indeed some might urge that the shepherds' experience was too great for such rough uneducated fellows as they were. The vision should have been granted to cultured people who could have appreciated it fully and given a studied account of what happened. Not so. The shepherds had a wisdom of their own, of the heart if not of the head, and therefore they did not sit down, as philosophers most likely would have done, to debate upon the vision and analyse the revelation; they acted upon it. They did not discuss the angels who were no longer there, but proceeded to investigate the Babe who was there. 'Let us now go even unto Bethlehem and see this thing.' It seems a wise and most practical issue to a great experience. If we did as they did, we would not so often find our Christmas exaltation ending in depression. For Christmas comes not that we should enjoy ourselves when it is here, but much more that we should live in its spirit when it is over. The divine revelation is not given chiefly that we may know, but that we may do.

The shepherds went to Bethlehem to confirm the vision of the night and to take a personal share in the thing that brought the angels to the sky. Perhaps it was because they were ready to give revelation this practical turn, that the vision was granted to them and not to wise people who would have dissipated it in empty speculation. So if our hearts have been at all touched by the Christmas spirit, let us do something about it, and we shall not feel depressed because the angels are gone away from us.

2. Among the great words read at Christmas time not the least are these: 'The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light.' The people who were in darkness needed light, and they got it. But though they were in darkness, they were walking, plodding on in the direction to which their previous light had pointed. To such a people light is always given.

Now the light by which these people had been walking was not brilliant. It was hardly more than a gleam, possibly just enough to show how deep the surrounding darkness was. But Isaiah has another word that comes in here. 'Arise, shine, for thy light is come.' How many people there are who refuse to shine because their light is not as bright as they think it ought to be. They will not shine unless they get exactly the same light as someone else has got. They will not shine unless there is not one mote left in the sunbeams; though, if that were possible, it would mean that there was no need for them to do any shining at all.

We are called to shine with such glimmer as is granted to us; with the small experience that is ours, we are to make our testimony. It is not so much because our vision is wonderful that we must tell others about it, but rather that where so much is dark we do see something and can walk in the direction of what we do see. It has been said that faith is taking a step in the dark, but not into the dark. Is it not, rather, taking a step in the light although that is only a gleam? At any rate, the rule of faith is that when we take that step, the light grows. If we have felt that the spirit of Christmas is the spirit in which men should live all the year round, that is the light which has come to us, and in which we are to shine, trying to keep on in this spirit even though the angels have gone away.

3. There is a little verse of poetry which gives a curious example of 'light for acting upon,' since its light is actually darkness, light withheld. When John Bright lost his wife, all went black for him. Then Cobden visited him and spoke of the thousands who were just as sad as he was. The illumination did not lie in the thought of how many were as badly off as he was, but in his friend's persuasion

that he could do something about it. The task was his light. And here is the little verse:

The good Lord made the earth and sky,
The rivers and the sea, . . . and ME.
He made no roads; but here am I,
As happy as can be.
'Tis just as though He said
'John, that's the job for thee.'

When the angels are gone, *and there are no roads*, our light has come in a something needing to be done, and in our ability to try our hand at doing it. And, remember, when the angels were there, the shepherds were sore afraid. Only when the angels were gone and the shepherds took up their part, did these latter come to glorifying and praising God.

4. The poet says that sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier days. That is true only if we have neglected or misused the happier days when we had them. But if we rejoiced in them when they were there, and let our hearts go out on their prompting, the great hours of insight will not exhaust their helpfulness in the brief space when heaven was opened to us, but will enter into our lives against the darkness yet to be, so that remembering them we shall walk and not grow weary.

The fact is that some of us are not good at our tenses. We do not get beyond the past and the present. Whereas the past and the present are given to make sure of the future-perfect. The angels may have gone, but the fact that we have seen them should kindle expectation of something not less fine yet to be. When the disciples were sore afraid and their faces bowed to the dust, they who were clad in shining garments said to them: 'Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee.' Wherever we are now, we have been with Him in Galilee. We have had our lights by the way. And if the angels are now gone away from us, the thing to do is to go and see this that has come to pass, *which the Lord hath made known unto us*.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

Going Out and Coming In.

BY CANON F. B. MACNUTT, CANON OF CANTERBURY, CHAPLAIN TO THE KING.

'The Lord shall keep thy going out and thy coming in, From this time forth and for evermore.'—Ps 121[8] (R.V.).

This greatly loved psalm, full of trust and confidence in the care and guidance of God, as Dr. Oesterley points out, presents us with a picture of a company of pilgrims going up to Jerusalem, as they carry on a dialogue in song with one of their number who acts as their leader. First the leader speaks: 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.' The pilgrim singers respond: 'My help is from God, Maker of heaven and earth;' and the leader continues: 'May He not suffer my foot to slip! May my guardian not slumber!' The rest of the psalm is a declaration by the singers that the defence of God cannot fail and that He will shield from all harm and guard from danger in every crisis of life, with this ending, 'The Lord shall keep thy going out and thy coming in, From this time forth for evermore.'

That phrase, 'going out and coming in,' catches the eye at once. Again and again we meet it in the Old Testament. For example, Moses at the end of his life says, 'I can no more go out and come in' (Dt 31[2]), and Solomon in prayer at the beginning of his reign says, 'I am but a little child: I know not how to go out and come in.' It is the Hebrew way of describing the movement and rhythm of life which never stands still. And because life is full of meanings which lie deep down below the surface, like so many other Old Testament phrases this one suggests much more than appears in a surface reading. Especially must any one with a real and living spiritual experience feel this as one year passes out, and we 'go out' with it, and another succeeds into which we 'come in.'

1. First, there is the very literal routine of daily living—'going out and coming in'—in which in all ways, spiritual and temporal, we need the care and guardianship of God. Every morning sees us going out into the toils and tasks of the day, in the home or out of it, and every evening witnesses our return to the starting-point for refreshment and rest. Day and night, work and rest, alternately follow one another across the stage of our earthly existence. What a merciful provision it is, though now under present conditions the normal routine is so often broken by the demands of war-work and the fulfilment of war-duties. But even now, except in extreme emergencies on active service, there is still a time for the going out and a time for the coming in. The man, and frequently now the woman, of the house hurries off to work and business, and when day is ended they return to the recreating influences of the evening at home. That is the literal routine of life for most of us, and we may be thankful for it, and pray for the time when the alarms and labours of war will give place at last to the humane normalities of peace.

2. But there is a rhythm of life which goes deeper than the interchange of work and rest, of business and home. I mean the going out of the soul into the active life of duty and its coming in to the source and centre of its life and power.

When a clergyman of the Church of England is inducted into the charge of his church and parish, the officiating archdeacon lays his hand upon the key of the church door and blesses him in the words of this psalm: 'The Lord preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time henceforth and for evermore.' He will be constantly going out from the church into the actual world of the parish for work and service to his people in their homes and occupations, and as surely he will be returning regularly to the church for the ministry of the Word and Prayer and Worship. That is symbolical of the parallel process of life in service which depends for its character and continuance upon constant and equal spiritual

renewal—the coming in of prayer, and thought, and worship, and self-dedication, always preceding and always following the going out into the service which is 'the rent we pay for our place on earth,' the contribution which we make to life as we put our talents to use for God and our fellow-men.

This opens out a whole world of spiritual truth which is vital to the growth of character and a right use of life. And the recognition of this was never needed more than here and now under the strains of war. Was there ever a time when we who are named with the name of Christ have needed as we need now to 'come in' to God to replenish our wasting and constantly expended resources. Like a ship we must revisit our base to refit and repair for going out again to sea.

> The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers.

But the world has to be with us so long and so drastically now that, if we are spiritually alert and alight, we must be acutely conscious of the danger of making an end in itself of activity and doing, without any regard to being and becoming. When life functions under pressure such as we are enduring, we are forced up against the practical problem of how to maintain our contact with God and our fellowship with Christ. We have duties to perform and services to render as becomes Christian men and women as well as loyal members of our nation. And our spiritual resources are soon exhausted, if we are living on our spiritual capital, and our souls are starved and feeble, and less and less able to give to others because we ourselves are not receiving from God.

> Build soil. Turn the farm in upon itself.
> The thought I have and my first impulse
> To take to market, I will turn it under.
> The thought from that thought, I will turn it under,
> And so to the limit of my nature.
> We are too much out, and if we won't draw in
> We shall be driven in.

This is so, also, in the life of our minds. Unless we are continually feeding them and taking in, there is soon an enfeebling and disintegration of them which makes their going out futile and ineffective, and threadworn and shrivelled in their witness for God and goodness.

3. Let us see how this works out in one most important direction. There has come to the Church of Christ in war-time a fresh summons to fulfil its social duty in bearing its witness to the standards of the Kingdom of God in social and national life. How slow the Church usually is to respond to such calls we have seen for many years, and indeed still see when Christians decline for various reasons to support their leaders in urging that the nation shall see to it that the genuine wants of the needy shall be supplied, and that employment at whatever cost to the community shall be found for the genuinely unemployed. In the fierce light of war-time we are seeing the vision of social duty in a new way and are growingly conscious that the political prejudices of vested interests against the discharge of plain duties are in principle as unchristian as totalitarian tyranny itself. There is a 'going out' into the world of social duty which, in greater or less degree, is an essential part of Christian service for all of us and an obligation of every full and loyal Christian life.

But the emphasis which is now being laid upon this vocation to service, as a part of the Christian 'going out' into life, stresses all the time the vital need of the 'coming in' of Christian people for the renewal of spiritual resources and the increase of spiritual power. Loving our neighbour as ourselves implies such service to others as unselfish love will certainly render to those who need it. But to think, as so many do, that this is the paramount thing in religion and that private prayer and devotion, religious thinking and reading, and public worship can be pushed into the background without seriously failing to fulfil our vocation, is as fatal in its spiritual results as has ever been the failure of Christians to rise to the heights of their social mission and to stand for the loftiest social ideals in national life and government. Secular humanism sometimes invokes the name and authority of Christ while yet it is void of that spiritual 'coming in' which is sure fruit of the love of God, and is the first and last thing in the life of the true Christian.

> There is no expeditious road
> To pack and label men for God,
> And save them by the barrel-load.

Christianity stands for no cloistered holiness, cut off from the common life of men; but it tells us in words so plain that none can miss it that it is only as man 'comes in' to God in faith and self-surrender that he can hope to 'go out' into life with a hope to build up anything that will survive the testing strains of time and the severity of the Divine judgment.

4. Let us then 'go out' into the coming year with this clear purpose, everywhere and at all times to match the 'going out' into the world of work and daily living with a sure and equal 'coming in' to God in prayer, and thought, and worship. Difficult though it may be in a year such as this is bound to be, with its unknown tasks and dangers, let us begin the year with the definite intention, born of experience, never to cease from drawing near to God. 'Draw near to God, and he will draw near to you.'

Citizenship and Civil Obedience.

By the Reverend Duncan Blair, M.C., B.D., Newlands, Glasgow.

I.

The generally accepted view of Paul's ruling on the matter of civil duty, as laid down in Ro 13, is to the effect that it contemplates only that form of Roman rule with which he was personally familiar, to whose justice and tolerance, moreover, he owed so large a measure of security and freedom. How far is it permissible to infer the invalidity of such guidance under altered systems of State control—such as supervened, for example, in later stages of Roman history? How far, indeed, are we justified in pressing Paul's pronouncement into the service of situations, not, at the moment of writing, present to his mind?

In his admirable contribution to this discussion (The Expository Times, April 1943), Mr. Grant has no hesitation in advancing to affirmative reply.

> 'Of the modern (Totalitarian) State,' he writes, '"which declares its own authority to be the source of all authority," we can only conceive that Paul would say that it is a perversion, with no legitimate claim to our obedience.'

One proof of this assumption Mr. Grant finds in Paul's introduction of the concept of 'conscience.'

'The citizen is to obey the governor because he seriously believes that the edict is in accordance with righteousness.'

'It was righteousness, administered by the State, and commending itself to the individual conscience, which had to be heartily obeyed.'

Whether such an inference (justifying, as it does, an attitude of non-conformity, passive resistance, or active disobedience in given situations) is warrantable, along such lines of exegetical reading, is matter for doubt and careful re-examination. Since, ex-hypothesi, Paul has no hypothetical case in mind, are we justified in advancing to any inference whatsoever? A strong presumptive case for such wider interpretation of the Apostle's meaning in regard to Christian duty can, no doubt, be founded upon *a priori* understanding of the spirit and principles which govern his general outlook. But the more guarded construction of Dr. Gore might appeal to many as, perhaps, the more literally accurate.

'While this passage exalts the normal duty of obedience, it suggests *no* answers to the question.' 'Is there not a point where the Government so manifestly fails to maintain the Divine Order in the world, or to represent the Will of God, and the best interests of the people, that it deserves to be put an end to?' 'Such a situation is not, at the moment, under review.'

II.

But if modern interpretations, while suggesting definite limitation of the counsel to conditions only which commend themselves to the Christian conscience, take the liberty of inferring a *contrary* ruling under intolerant systems of civil authority, it is a matter of some interest to consider how far historical interpretations, from within the Lutheran tradition, have accepted the more unqualified implications of the Apostle's ruling to the Church at Rome, and made them the basis of a doctrine of unmurmuring acquiescence in State decrees, whatever their character and bearing.

These interpretations form the substance of a highly developed theory of 'World-Orders' whose principles have been ably analysed and set forth by Professor Wendland in his paper to the Universal Christian Council of Life and Work (1934).

To begin with, the title given by Luther to such 'orders' seems to argue his adherence to Paul's explicit account of their function, if not to a view of their binding force for Christians under all complexions of State authority.

They are 'Ordinationes Dei,' in terms of Paul's emphatic pronouncement, 'No authority exists apart from God.' 'The existing authorities have been constituted by God.' (Moffatt.)

It is therefore the business of the Church and theology to proclaim 'World Orders.' Otherwise they fall either into individualism or into an abstract teaching of the Will of God.

There is thus raised the whole question of the degree of Divine authority attaching to such orders, as the main factor in determining the attitude of the Christian citizen, who, in the same moment, owes allegiance to his Sovereign Lord Christ.

III.

According to Luther, the totality of God's activity in human history may be best presented to reason under two modes of expression, one, that of creating or preserving, the other, that of redeeming. In 'World Orders,' he sees the special vehicle of the former. In the Church, he sees the special organ of the latter. World institutions, on this view, are called into being for the purpose

of preserving or safeguarding for man the possibility of an historical existence. Though they are secular realities in every community, we have in them the Presence of God, even though indirectly and hidden. Situate as they are between the Creation and the Fall, on one side, and the new Creation on the other, these orders are institutions *ad interim*.

Luther recognizes two ways in which these orders may be sinned against, either by detaching them from their Creator and His Commandments and making idols of them, or else by rejecting and scorning them.

'Nevertheless,' he insists, 'his sin cannot destroy the Divinity of the Orders.'

It will thus be apparent, that although it is what Luther calls a 'muddy holiness,' or a 'worldly godliness,' he sees expressed in State power and civil authority, a profound sense of their inherent sanctity pervades his thinking, to constitute a solemn claim upon man's implicit obedience, irrespective of their character for the time being.

IV.

As to the reasons, in Luther's case, for such a rendering of the Pauline ruling, we are dependent upon surmise. His openly defiant attitude towards an intolerant ecclesiastical régime makes the fact of his docility towards State decrees however tyrannical only the more paradoxical. But one may be permitted to suggest *three* main causes at work in the Reformer's consciousness to account for this submissive attitude.

First. His jealousy for the validity of Apostolic counsel as a necessary corollary of the Reformed theory of Biblical infallibility.

It seems evident, that whatever modern exegetes find in the ruling of Ro 13 to justify limits to its applicability, Luther's mind was more or less anchored to Paul's opening pronouncements in their most literal and unqualified form.

'The magistrate is God's servant for your benefit.' 'Anyone who resists authority is opposing the divine order' (Moffatt). The Reformers, who built their Creed four square upon an inerrant Scripture, were shy of binding the Word to historical contexts or incidental situations in time.

Secondly. His recognition of the necessity and value of such 'orders,' as providing the framework of historical life, in which man may find scope for responsible action.

An ever-present sense of the potentially lawless state of earthly kingdoms, and of the world-wide menace of brute force and violence, exalted his view of the function of the State as a restraining power, making for the possibility of historical determination, and the progressive realization of the Kingdom of God through the redeeming agency of the Church.

Thirdly. His sense of the temporary, *ad interim*, and hence fleeting character of world institutions, which leads the Christian believer to sit lightly to the worst they can do. 'Fret not thyself because of evil doers, for they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb.'

Luther undoubtedly regarded State idolatry as sinful. But, in his profound regard for State authority, as ordained by God, one may find the grounds of strong temptation in that direction, and perhaps to the practice of a pietism which regards protest against or even active participation on the Christian's part, in, political life, a vain and needless impertinence.

Contributions and Comments.

'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Corinthians iii. 17, 18).

In these verses there are two phrases of disputable meaning, which are important in considering the question as to whether St. Paul identified the exalted Lord with the Holy Spirit or not.

(1) 17a. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν·

It may be interesting to indicate the diversity of opinion in the interpretation of these words. Among those who regard them as an identification of Christ with the Spirit are: R. H. Strachan (*Moffatt N.T. Commentary on 2 Cor.*), H. Wheeler Robinson (*The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, 11 and 230), C. H. Dodd (*The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 147), R. C. Moberly (*Atonement and Personality*, 197 f.), Thomas Rees (*The Holy Spirit*, 98 f.), T. R. Glover (*Paul of Tarsus*, 219), A. H. McNeile (*St. Paul*, 284), C. Anderson Scott (*Peake's Commentary*, but cf. his *Christianity according to St. Paul*, 259 f.), and H. A. A. Kennedy (*The Theology of the Epistles*, 89, with some qualification). Deissmann writes: 'In the first place this sentence is an exegetical note on the immediately preceding quotation from the Septuagint, but it is also regarded by itself typical for Paul's view of Christ' (*Paul*, 138 n.).

The following scholars do not accept this verse as an identification of Christ with the Spirit: J. H. Bernard (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*), H. L. Goudge (*Westminster Commentary*), J. K. Mozley (*Gore's Commentary*), Sydney Cave (*The Gospel of St. Paul*, 179), E. F. Scott (*The Spirit in the New Testament*, 180 f.), Vincent Taylor (*The*

1937 Headingley Lectures, 46), R. Newton Flew (*The Idea of Perfection*, 50 f.), A. E. J. Rawlinson (*The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, 155 n.), H. Maldwyn Hughes (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Feb., 1934). R. Birch Hoyle in his article on the Holy Spirit in the *E.R.E.* writes: 'Of the relation of the Spirit to Christ, Paul never speaks explicitly. The Spirit is imparted as the Spirit of the Risen Christ, and their working is practically identical, though some distinction is apparent. But that distinction is never presented as an eternal immanent relation, nor does Paul throw any light upon the Christological question whether the Spirit is Christ's "very own".' Dr. A. M. Hunter suggests 'What Paul really did was to Christianize —or better to "Christify"—the Spirit,' but he considers that Paul did not identify the two (*Paul and his Predecessors*, 119 f.).

The scholars who deny identification here generally accept one of two alternative interpretations. Either (1) the verse is a strong statement of the 'equivalence of function' of the Lord (Christ) and the Spirit, falling short of identification. Or (2) it is an identification of God ('the Lord' in the LXX sense) with the Spirit, for *v.*[16] is a reminiscence of Ex 34[34], and Paul means '"The Lord" in the passage I have quoted is the Spirit.' Dr. H. M. Hughes suggested the rendering 'Now God is the Spirit' (EXPOSITORY TIMES, Feb. 1934).

It may be that, as Dr. Strachan puts it, 'the term "Lord" hovers between a reference to God and to Christ. In other words, Paul sees in the Old Testament words of Exodus 34[34] an allegorical reference to Christ.' Further 'The Jews did not need to turn to Yahweh but to Christ.' Hence it seems that to refer Κύριος to Ex 34[34] does not finally establish the case against identifying Christ with the Spirit. We know that consideration of the original meaning of a word in its historical setting did not deter Paul from using it with a Christian connotation. This would be especially likely to occur in the case of such a title as Κύριος. On the question of its general usage in the Pauline *Epistles*, Dr. Hughes made some interesting observations (EXPOSITORY TIMES, Feb. 1934). Having pointed out that Paul normally uses Κύριος of Christ, he mentions three qualifying conditions: (1) Not in quotations from the O.T., as in Ro 4[8], 9[28], etc. (2) Usually (but not invariably) Paul adds 'Christ' (or one of its cognates) to Κύριος when he means Christ. (3) There are some passages in which it is not clear whether Paul intends Κύριος to mean Christ or God.

As to (1), while there are passages in which Paul in quoting from the O.T. retains the meaning 'God' for Κύριος, there are surely a number of others into which he imports the meaning 'Christ.' Anderson Scott writes: 'In the Epistles of St. Paul the transference of this title to Christ is almost complete' (*Christianity according to St. Paul*, 250). He continues, it is true, 'That is to say, there are only a few instances, and those for the most part quotations, in which it is used with reference to God, and a few more where the reference is uncertain.' But it is clear that Scott would not assert that Κύριος means 'God' even in all Paul's O.T. quotations, for he gives a number of examples where it is transferred from God to Christ (p. 253). He quotes with reference to a non-Pauline passage some words of Windisch which seem to be equally true of Pauline usage, 'One may observe how Christian exegesis simply transferred to Christ Old Testament language concerning Jehovah.'

With regard to Dr. Hughes' second qualification, it seems true that when Κύριος stands for Christ it is more usually accompanied by one of the personal names. But ὁ Κύριος alone used of Christ is by no means uncommon. (In 2 Co it is of comparable frequency with the other form, though its enumeration is necessarily a subjective matter, as Dr. Hughes' third point suggests.)

To sum up, when allowance has been made for the fact that 'Paul is moving here in the realm of unanalysed experience' (Strachan), and that his words follow upon an O.T. reminiscence, there seems to be nothing to preclude the conception that he identifies Christ with the Spirit. His emphasis here as elsewhere is 'dynamic' rather than ontological.

(It seems hardly necessary to discuss the facile emendation, mentioned, though not supported, by Denney in *The Expositor's Bible* (2 Co): οὗ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν.)

(2) 18[b] καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος.

These words, like the previous verse, have given rise to a variety of interpretations. Plummer in the *I.C.C.* declares that in each case 'we must be content to remain in doubt' as to the exact meaning. He cites the main possible renderings as follows:

(1) 'even as by the Spirit of the Lord' (A.V.).
(2) 'even as from the Lord the Spirit' (R.V.).
(3) 'even as from the Spirit which is the Lord' (R.V., m.).
(4) 'even as from the Lord of the Spirit.'
(5) 'even as from the Lord who is spirit.'
(6) 'even as from a sovereign Spirit' (taking Κυρίου as an adjective, with Hort).

Plummer himself considers that (5) or (2) should be accepted.

Rendel Harris thought that here Marcion had preserved the true text καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνευμάτων, a close parallel to Enoch 38[4] (see the review of Harris' *Emendations to the Greek of the New Testament* in EXPOSITORY TIMES, Dec. 1935).

H. B. Swete accepts (5), comparing our verse with 1 Co 15[45-49] (*The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, 195 f.).

Some recent writers have defended (1), which is the rendering of the Vulgate: 'tanquam a Domini Spiritu.' So *e.g.* E. F. Scott, 'This version is grammatically the most natural and is also most in keeping with the context' (*The Spirit in the New Testament*, 182). A. D. Nock also uses this rendering in his *St. Paul*, 203.

But (2), the version of the R.V. text, supported also by *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, Weymouth and Moffatt, would seem to have gained wider acceptance. J. H. Bernard unhesitatingly adopts it 'inasmuch as it best brings out the identi-

fication of Κύριος and Πνεῦμά in *v.* 17' (*Expositor's Greek Testament*). Perhaps one may refer to Lk 23[2] for a rough grammatical parallel: λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν Χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι (if Χριστὸν be read as a noun). There is a similar concatenation of two nouns in apposition, though they do not happen to be in the genitive case in Lk 23[2].

In the consideration of these verses it is surely necessary to bear in mind the very fluid nature of early Christian reflection. We must avoid importing into the 'mobility' of early Christian thought (to use Canon Crum's word in another connexion), the fixity and precision of a later age. Paul wrote before the doctrine of περιχώρησις had been conceived. Dr. A. R. Johnson in his recent study, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*, having examined the 'fluidity of reference from the One to the Many or from the Many to the One' in the O.T., significantly cites as a N.T. parallel the correlation of Christ and the Spirit in Paul. He adds, 'Paul here reveals himself as a true son of Israel; and Dodd is right in rejecting the view that this feature of Paul's thinking involves "a certain depersonalizing of the idea of Christ"' (p. 20).

Dr. E. F. Scott, in criticising the statement that Paul identified the Spirit and Christ writes: 'Nothing is more remarkable in the early Christology than the absence of any suggestion that in Jesus the Spirit became incarnate.' He mentions some distant approaches to this suggestion in the New Testament, adding, 'The doctrine that the eternal principle of the Logos became flesh in Christ had been everywhere accepted before a century was passed. Yet we meet with no theory that he was the Incarnate Spirit' (*The Spirit in the New Testament*, 182). If data of the period 150–250 may be considered, however, there is good evidence for a 'Spirit-Christology.' In amassing such evidence, Mr. H. J. Carpenter states, 'the identification of an original and constituent element in the historical Christ with divine Spirit is common and persistent in writers of this period' (see his article in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1939). The identification described occurs, sometimes combined with, sometimes opposed to, the Logos-Son Christology.

It is interesting to note an archæological sidelight on this question, which furnishes evidence of a late, apparent identification of the Son with the Spirit. Mr. A. W. Wade-Evans, in his *Welsh Christian Origins*, (22), refers to a stone cross of the seventh to ninth century found in S.E. Wales, bearing the inscription, 'In the name of God the Father, and of the Son, the Holy Spirit.'

If the theory of identification in these verses is valid, it does not presuppose a daring in Paul's thought at this point which is unparalleled elsewhere in his Epistles. We need only cite the very venturesome use of a rabbinic midrash at 1 Co 10[4] to yield the statement 'the rock was Christ.'

The identification, if it be granted, may well be limited, in its reference, to Christian experience. So H. R. Mackintosh suggests, probably voicing the general opinion: 'By the form of identification St. Paul indicates just the familiar experiential fact that Christ and the Holy Spirit are so indissociably one, that from the point of view of practical faith they are seen as true equivalents of each other' (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, 60). We do well to remember the significance of the Damascus experience for Paul. That experience implied that 'the reality of Christ's nature was Spirit' (Moffatt). Or in Schweitzer's words, 'For Paul the Spirit is the life-principle of His (Christ's) Messianic personality.'

The interpretation supported here is not devoid of religious and theological value. To say that the Spirit was no other than Christ meant 'the elevation of the idea of Spirit from the category of substance to that of personality' (C. H. Dodd in *The Meaning of Paul for To-day*). Or as Dr. Wheeler Robinson elucidates the two-sided significance of *v.* 17[a]. 'If the Lord gave personality to the Spirit, the Spirit gave ubiquity to the Lord' (*The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, 19).

Of all Christians after the first generation it may be said, 'No man hath seen Christ at any time; the Spirit hath declared Him.' The Son was the 'exegesis' of the Father; the Spirit is the 'exegesis' of the Son.

D. R. Griffiths.

Caerleon Baptist Church, Mon.

Entre Nous.

Peace and Goodwill.

Dr. Lin Yutang, the well-known Chinese author and philosopher, speaking at New York, said: 'Only the child can see the simple, obvious things, and only one who can see the simple, obvious things can build a peace, or enter the Kingdom of God. I am serious. When I say sincere, I mean true goodwill and a hospitable view towards the other man, for only with that Christian goodwill and sincerity can we make a better world for ourselves. We to-day have lost that faith and that simplicity, and that's why we are fighting now. The shepherds of Asia Minor two thousand years ago heard or related that "goodwill towards men" had something to do with "peace on earth." We have advanced scientifically so far that we cannot see the connexion between the two. The politicians cannot see the obvious, and are relying upon mechanical treaties and power politics.

'No, we cannot escape the simple things of life, physical or moral. We cannot live without the trees, the birds, the river breeze, or the moon, except at our peril. And we cannot live without God, freedom, equality, and goodwill and faith in fellow-men. Am I moralizing? But the very fact that we are ashamed of moralizing is a bad sign of our age. Perhaps I am because I am a

Chinese. 'To be ashamed of moralizing is to be ashamed of spiritual truths, but without spiritual truths human life simply cannot go on. But to-day we are afraid of the simple words, like *goodness* and *mercy* and *kindness*. Our preachers and publicists would like to avoid the terms *goodness* and *mercy* and rather speak of the "spiritual values" or "social values." Such phrases have a queer, dehydrated, synthetic flavour about them, and suggest that the bones of our morality have been picked pretty clean. We don't believe in the good old words because we don't believe in the good old values any more. And that is why the world is so sick.

'I want to conclude with a story about Confucius. Tsekung asked about government, and Confucius replied, "The people must have sufficient food; there must be a sufficient army; and there must be faith in the nation." "If you were forced to give up one of these three factors of government, which would you give up first?" asked Tsekung. "I would go without the army first," was the reply. "And if you were forced to go without one of the two remaining factors, which would you rather go without?" asked Tsekung again. "I would go without sufficient food. There have been deaths in every generation, but no nation without faith can stand." '

The Big Ben Minute.

During the fighting in the mountains around Jerusalem early in December 1917, two officers of a west country yeomanry battalion discussed the war and its probable aftermath. They were in a billet in the entrance to a cave on the hillside, on the eve of a battle. One of them, a man of unusual character and vision, had an intuition that he would not come through the imminent battle alive.

'I shall not come through this war alive,' he said, 'and like millions of other men, it will be my destiny to go on now. You will survive, and you will live to see a greater and more final conflict fought out on every continent. When that time comes, remember us who have gone on ahead. We shall long to play our part, wherever we may be. Give us the opportunity to do so. *We* shall not fight with material weapons, but there will be ways in which we can help you, if you will let us do so. We shall be an unseen but mighty army. Give us the chance to pull our weight. You will still have "time" available as your servant—*lend us a moment of it* each day, and through your silence, give us our opportunity. The power of silence is greater than you know.'

The speaker was killed next day at Beit ur el Foka. His companion was wounded but reached the British lines safely. When the war was over he set himself to fulfil his friend's request for 'a moment each day.' The task he undertook was a stupendous one. It was to unite people everywhere in the observance of a minute's silence for dedication and prayer. He began by trying to interest people in positions of influence, M.P.s, scout leaders, churchmen, heads of the services, newspapers, teachers, and others. Gradually his campaign made way. Twenty thousand letters and leaflets were sent out, a special pamphlet was written called *The Spiritual Front* and largely circulated. In the end he succeeded in obtaining the co-operation of the B.B.C. and that is why since April 23 of this year the official daily programme of the B.B.C. includes the announcement, 'Big Ben Minute,' in large type. It is estimated that now no less than five million people observe the silent minute before the news.

These facts are taken from an interesting book, *The Big Ben Minute*, by Mr. Andrew Dakers (Dakers; 2s. 6d. net). The book contains eleven chapters in which different aspects of this observance are explained. Doubtless many of the five million people who keep the minute will be glad to have this volume in which they will find hints on how best to use the silence and many details about its history and value.

The Jew and the Individual.

'The regard for the individual man, whatever his condition, race, or nation, is one of the main themes of the Mosaic law and of the prophets. It is summarized in the words of Malachi: "Have not we all one father? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, profaning the covenant of our fathers?" The Talmud has a striking homily, that God created only one human person in the beginning, as a token to man that he who has destroyed only one life is as if he destroyed mankind; whereas he who has preserved one life is as though he preserved all men. Another reason for the creation of only one man is for the sake of peace and equality, so that none may say: "My ancestry is better than yours." God stamped all men with the die of Adam, and yet no man is like his fellow. Each has the right to say he is the end and goal of all creation. It is characteristic too of the Jewish reverence for life that the traditional wish on joyful or sad occasions is "For Life".' [1]

Money.

Mr. Vincent Sheean, the American journalist, in his latest book, *Between the Thunder and the Sun*, tells that when he was in Paris in 1940 he called on M. Léon Blum after Mr. Churchill had become Prime Minister. M. Léon Blum recalled some advice Mr. Churchill had given to him at Maxine's *château* about what a young man entering politics should do. One of the first rules, Mr. Churchill said, was to be careful not to value money too much. 'Yes, it is true,' M. Blum replied, '*M. Churchill n'a pas du tout l'âme capitaliste*.'

[1] Norman Bentwich, 'Judaism and the Crisis,' in *The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct.–Dec., 1943.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.